

purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2206). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, House Report No. 2207. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2208. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. STIGLER: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 1043. An act to set aside certain lands in Oklahoma in trust for the Indians of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Indian Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2209). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JACKSON: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 4983. A bill to provide for adjustments in connection with the Crow Irrigation project, Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.; with amendments (Rept. No. 2210). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. JACKSON: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 6195. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 751), entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe for the distribution of tribal funds, and for other purposes," as amended by the act of May 26, 1926 (44 Stat. 658); without amendment (Rept. No. 2211). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 6403. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Amelia Shidzee Nagamine Toneman; with amendment (Rept. No. 2203). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HEALY:

H. R. 6668. A bill to provide additional facilities for the prevention of labor disputes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 6669. A bill to provide for apportionment of a veteran's pension, compensation, or retirement pay during hospitalization, institutional or domiciliary care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 6670. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act, as amended, by giving insurance benefits under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance provisions of that act to survivors of veterans of World War II, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOMENGEAUX:

H. R. 6671. A bill to extend, for one additional year, the provisions of the Sugar Act of 1937, as amended, and the taxes with respect to sugar; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 6672. A bill to promote the progress of science and the useful arts, to secure the national defense, to advance the national health and welfare, and for other purposes;

to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 6673. A bill to amend section 6 of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. BOREN:

H. R. 6674. A bill to insure the proper hospital care to members of the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROE of New York:

H. R. 6675. A bill to provide for certificate of meritorious award to State guards; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BALDWIN of New York:

H. R. 6676. A bill for the relief of John Babjak and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HERTER:

H. R. 6677. A bill for the relief of Edward J. Haddigan and John F. Haddigan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 6678. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gertrude Wooten; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHERIDAN:

H. R. 6679. A bill for the relief of Louis Schmidhamer; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1929. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of Miss Bessie M. Hubbs and other residents of Onondaga County, N. Y., urging legislation to prevent the use of grain in the manufacture of alcoholic beverages; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1930. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the governors' conference, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for extension of selective service and adoption of compulsory military training and service program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1931. By Mr. ARNOLD: Petition of members of the Home Culture Extension Club, Laclede, Mo., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the sugar shortage; to the Committee To Investigate Supplies and Shortages of Food.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 5, 1946

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 5, 1946)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God our Father, in the stillness of prayer, as the loud poundings of the builders cease, always we are conscious of a persistent knocking at our heart's door and of a tender, pleading voice, which steals into the emptiness of our self-content, calling: "If any man will open the door, I will come in." Solennize us with the knowledge that only our hand can open the door that keeps Thee out of our lives which, without

Thee, are but vanity and vexation of spirit. If Thou comest dressed drably as duty, may we earn at the last Thy "well done." If Thou comest in the white garments of truth, may we not fail to follow the road though rough and steep. As we fare forth in Thy fear, prosper us this day in our work; so may we fulfill our daily tasks with honor and integrity, walking ever in the ways of Thy commandments. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MAYBANK, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, June 4, 1946, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MAYBANK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Hickenlooper	Overton
Austin	Hill	Pepper
Ball	Hoey	Reed
Barkley	Huffman	Revercomb
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Briggs	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Brooks	Kilgore	Saitonstall
Buck	Knowland	Shipstead
Burch	La Follette	Smith
Bushfield	Langer	Stanfill
Butler	Lucas	Stewart
Capehart	McCarran	Taft
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McKellar	Tobey
Donnell	McMahon	Tunnell
Downey	Magnuson	Tydings
Eastland	Maybank	Vandenberg
Ellender	Mead	Wagner
Ferguson	Millikin	Walsh
Fulbright	Mitchell	Wheeler
George	Moore	Wherry
Green	Morse	White
Guffey	Murdoch	Wiley
Gurney	Murray	Wilson
Hart	Myers	
Hawkes	O'Daniel	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CARVILLE], and the Senators from Idaho [Mr. GOSSETT and Mr. TAYLOR] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] are detained on public business.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS COMMEMORATING THE LIFE, CHARACTER, AND PUBLIC SERVICES OF THE LATE PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. House Concurrent Resolution 152, providing for a joint session of the Congress on Monday, July 1, 1946, for the purpose of holding appropriate exercises in commemoration of the life, character, and public services of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States, has been duly adopted by both Houses. Under the terms of that resolution, the President of the Senate is directed to appoint a committee representing the Senate. On that committee the Chair appoints the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A petition signed by sundry members of the Washington (D. C.) Committee for Americans of Japanese Ancestry, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 2127) to create an Evacuation Claims Commission under the general supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, and to provide for the powers, duties, and functions thereof, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens of Sacred Heart, Minn., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 599, to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in periodicals, newspapers, and motion pictures, and over the radio; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

PRESERVATION OF AMERICAN LIBERTIES AND INSTITUTIONS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have received a very interesting statement from the American War Dads, Winfield (Kans.) Chapter, No. 71, the membership of which includes many of the best citizens of Kansas. I ask unanimous consent to have this statement printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN WAR DADS,
WINFIELD CHAPTER, No. 71,
Winfield, Kans., May 24, 1946.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We address you as the representatives of a few of the unorganized millions of American citizens, the truly "forgotten" men and women of our country, whose only "special" interest is the preservation of our American liberties, institutions, and way of life.

We are not opposed to necessary restrictions and regulations devised for real emergencies, but we are unalterably opposed to government by directives emanating from a nonelected and irresponsible bureaucratic system whose only achievement has been confusion worse confounded.

Our sons and daughters have fought another world war, and on foreign soil, not to promote regimentation and dictatorship within our own country, but to keep from its

shores the evils of all foreign isms and crackpot ideologies, and preserve to us, ourselves and their children, our priceless American heritage.

We affirm our faith and allegiance to the Constitution of the United States and to the principle of the sovereignty of man that it guarantees. We affirm our faith in our old-fashioned system of government by law, under which this Nation has grown and prospered, and not in government by man, under which foreign nations have perished. We affirm our faith in our American ideologies and in the fitness of the American people to govern themselves.

We look to you, as our duly elected representative, to exert your every effort to preserve to us and to our children the American principle of "government of, by, and for the people," and in its ever meaning and complete integrity.

Yours for good old-fashioned American government,

Winfield Chapter, No. 71, American War Dads: W. E. Broadie, President; H. H. Hanalen, Secretary; H. C. Wind, O. F. Brane, P. F. Weinrich, W. V. Hilderbran, C. H. Benson, G. L. Jarvis, Executive Board.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

H. J. Res. 360. Joint resolution to provide for United States participation in the Philippine independence ceremonies on July 4, 1946; with amendments (Rept. No. 1421).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 2018. A bill to facilitate the decentralization of the Veterans' Administration; without amendment (Rept. No. 1422);

S. 2099. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to accept gifts, devises, and bequests in behalf of the general post fund for the use of veterans and for the sale and conveyance of any such property under certain circumstances and the covering of the proceeds thereof into the post fund, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1423);

H. R. 5907. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant an easement for highway purposes to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, in certain lands in the reservation of the Veterans' Administration hospital, Lebanon County, Pa., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1424);

H. R. 6069. A bill to amend section 100 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; without amendment (Rept. No. 1425); and

H. R. 6153. A bill to remove the existing limitation on the number of associate members of the Board of Veterans' Appeals in the Veterans' Administration; without amendment (Rept. No. 1426).

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation two lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2296. A bill for the relief of Ira W. Baldwin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2297. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Joan Nabi Velasquez; to the Committee on Immigration.

S. 2298. A bill granting a pension to the dependent parents of Frank A. Guadagnoli; to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 2299. A bill for the relief of the estate of Lee Jones Cardy; and

S. 2300. A bill for the relief of Horst Specialty Manufacturing Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REVERCOMB:

S. 2301. A bill for the relief of Rev. John C. Young; to the Committee on Claims.

ORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS

Mr. LA FOLLETTE submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2177) to provide for increased efficiency in the legislative branch of the Government, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. MURRAY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 279), which was referred to the Committee To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 243, Seventy-ninth Congress, agreed to April 1, 1946, authorizing the Committee on Education and Labor to employ a special assistant to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$5,640 per annum, hereby is continued in full force and effect until June 30, 1947.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT LEGISLATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CAPPER

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject of the recently passed labor-management bills, delivered by him on June 2, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONTINUANCE OF THE SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT—ARTICLE BY GOULD LINCOLN

[Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on the subject of continuance of the Selective Service Act, by Gould Lincoln, published under the headline "The Political Mill," in the Washington Evening Star of June 5, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

RECORD OF SENATOR PEPPER—STATEMENT OF TAMPA JOINT ADVISORY BOARD OF THE CIGAR MAKERS INTERNATIONAL UNION

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by the Tampa Joint Advisory Board of the Cigar Makers International Union (AFL) in support of his record, which appears in the Appendix.]

RUSSIA RANKS STALIN GREATEST AMONG HER HISTORICAL LEADERS—ARTICLE BY EDDY GILMORE

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Russia Ranks Stalin Greatest Among Her Historical Leaders," written by Eddy Gilmore and published in the Washington Evening Star of June 5, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1940

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 2057) to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, until May 15, 1947, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I understood the question was on the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia on behalf of himself, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A perfecting amendment takes precedence over a substitute amendment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. A further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will the amendment which I mentioned be the next order of business?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be, unless some other perfecting amendment is offered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I renew my request that my amendment may be adopted so that it may be taken to conference, but I want to modify it before it is acted upon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has the right to modify his amendment.

Mr. GURNEY. I desire to obtain some information concerning the amendment. I wonder if the Senator would withhold pressing for action on it for half an hour or so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes, I will be glad to, if I may have unanimous consent to offer my amendment, after I shall have modified it, and thereby not prejudice action by the Senator from West Virginia with respect to his substitute amendment; but before final action is taken on the Senator's substitute amendment I want to offer my perfected amendment and have action taken on it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has that right under the rule.

Mr. GURNEY. Will the Senator from West Virginia proceed with a discussion of his amendment, and, when the Senator from Colorado has modified his amendment, permit him to offer his modified amendment?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Of course, I should not like to have a break in the continuity of the discussion of my amendment, but I will not hold up the consideration of the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Colorado can offer his modified amendment at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from West Virginia.

The question now is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute for the bill offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB], offered on behalf of himself, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, the pending question is upon an amendment which is in the nature of a substitute,

and which has been proposed on behalf of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], and myself. At this point in my remarks I ask that the amendment be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That section 16 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out 'July 1, 1946' and inserting in lieu thereof 'May 15, 1947': *Provided*, That no individual shall be inducted for training and service under such act unless the Congress by law declares that national security requires that inductions be resumed.

"Sec. 2. (a) There shall be discharged from or relieved from active duty in the military and naval forces of the United States, as rapidly as discharge facilities will permit, every member of such forces, or any component part of either, who applies therefor and who has on the date of enactment of this act one or more children to whom he bears, or would maintain, but for his service, a bona fide family relationship in his home: *Provided, however*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to anyone who has volunteered for service in the Army or the Navy.

"(b) Section 3 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Each man heretofore inducted under the provisions of subsection (a) who shall have served for a training and service period of at least 18 months shall be discharged upon his written application for discharge, as rapidly as discharge facilities will permit: *Provided*, That the foregoing provision shall not apply to any person who has voluntarily enlisted for a longer period of service."

"Sec. 3. This act shall not be deemed to affect the existing program of the Army and Navy for the discharge of men in the service on other grounds and for other reasons not named in this act, but shall be construed as an additional ground and reason in the demobilization and discharge of servicemen from the Army and the Navy.

"Sec. 4. Any person discharged under the provisions of this act shall be given and granted an honorable discharge, unless for cause found to be not entitled to honorable discharge.

"Sec. 5. The fourth proviso of the second sentence of section 3 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows: '*Provided further*, That on July 1, 1946, the number of men in active training or service in the Army shall not exceed 1,550,000, and that this number shall be reduced consistently month by month so that the Army's strength shall be 1,070,000 on July 1, 1947: *And provided further*, That on July 1, 1947 the number of men in active training or service in the Navy shall be 558,000 and in the Marine Corps 108,000.'

"Sec. 6. (a) The first paragraph of section 9 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The monthly base pay of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard shall be as follows: Enlisted men of the first grade, \$140; enlisted men of the second grade, \$118; enlisted men of the third grade, \$106; enlisted men of the fourth grade, \$94; enlisted men of the fifth grade, \$82; enlisted men of the sixth grade, \$70; and enlisted men of the seventh grade, \$65. Chief petty officers under acting appointment shall be included in the first grade at a monthly base pay of \$132."

"(b) The provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall become effective on the first day of the second calendar month following

its enactment, and no increase in pay for any period prior thereto shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act."

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, so that we may understand just what is in the amendment which is offered and how it differs from the bill reported by the Military Affairs Committee, I want to explain briefly the amendment, section by section. The first section of the amendment extends the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, to May 15, 1947. It provides, however, that no individual shall be inducted for training and service under the act unless Congress by law declares that the national security requires that inductions be resumed. That simply means that the Selective Service Act in all its parts and in all its force would be extended until May 15, 1947, but there would be no further inductions or enforced service under the act until the Congress so orders. In other words, that part of the law which deals with the priority in employment, with preference in employment of veterans, will be kept in force; that part of the law, section 9, which deals with the right of the President to seize properties under certain circumstances will be kept alive; but, Mr. President, no person will be inducted into the service under the act until Congress says that the national security requires it.

That position is taken upon the ground that further inductions are not necessary to the maintenance of the size of the force needed, and are not necessary for the return of men who have already seen service abroad. Later I shall discuss figures and facts to sustain that position.

The second section of the proposed amendment would relieve from active military duty in the Army and Navy, as rapidly as discharge facilities will permit, fathers who are now serving in the armed forces. I need not discuss that point at present, because later I shall go into that subject.

It is provided, in the latter part of the second section, that every man heretofore inducted under the provisions of the act who has had training and service of 18 months shall, upon his written application, be discharged. I expect to show, from figures furnished by the War Department itself, that every man in the service today who has had 18 months of service can be released, and the Army and Navy maintained at the proper level. That statement, of course, both as to the release of fathers and the release of men with 18 months of service, does not apply to volunteers.

Section 3 provides that the foregoing sections shall not be deemed to affect the existing program of demobilization, but shall be in addition thereto. They are directions of the Congress to the Army and Navy to bring about the discharge of fathers and men with 18 months of service. Under section 4 such men shall be granted honorable discharges unless, for cause shown, they are not entitled thereto.

Section 5 fixes the limit of the number of men to serve in the armed forces. It fixes the Army, as of July 1, 1946, at not to exceed 1,550,000. That is the number requested by the Army. It is the exact

number fixed in the bill to which the amendment is offered, so the amendment in the nature of a substitute includes that paragraph, because the substitute, if adopted, would take the place of the whole bill. The figure fixed for the Army is the Army's own figure. It has not been questioned. Furthermore, it has not been delved into. The Army asked for it, and it was granted. In order that there may be no question about the size of the Army, those of us responsible for offering the substitute have taken the figure of the Army itself, 1,550,000 men as of July 1 this year. As of July 1, 1947, the number of men in the Army is to be 1,070,000. That, again, is a figure requested by the Army itself. So there can be no debate on the question of the size of the Army. As to the Navy, the amendment provides that on July 1, 1947, the number of men in active training or service in the Navy shall be 558,000; and in the Marine Corps 108,000. Those are the figures requested by those particular branches of the service, and are the same figures as those contained in the bill reported by the able Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] on behalf of the Military Affairs Committee.

Section 6 deals with the pay of enlisted men in the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard. At this time I wish to modify the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has the right to modify his amendment.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I wish to modify section 6 (a) of the substitute by including as a part of it the pay schedule which was adopted by the Senate yesterday, so that there will be no difference in the base pay of members of the armed forces, as provided in the bill and as provided in the substitute.

That, in essence, is the sum and substance of the amendment.

First. It extends the Selective Training and Service Act until May 15, 1947, but stops inductions until Congress orders further inductions.

Second. It releases fathers from service.

Third. It releases from service men who have had 18 months of training and service in the Army or Navy.

Fourth. It fixes the size of the Army and Navy at the very figures requested by them.

Lastly, it raises the pay of enlisted men, in accordance with the schedule adopted by the Senate, starting in the lowest bracket with a base pay of \$75, representing an increase from \$50. That is done for the purpose of carrying through the plan to stimulate voluntary enlistments.

Let me say at the beginning of my remarks that I have advocated, and still advocate, a strong armed force—not only an adequate force, but a strong force. I, with others, have urged and insisted that the military and naval forces be placed upon a voluntary basis. Great success has been met under that plan. The Senate will recall that on October 6, 1945, the bill which was passed providing for voluntary enlistments became the law. I understand that the Navy is filling all its needs with volunteers. The number of Army volunteers has been built

up to such a point as to constitute a substantial part of our Army, and there is definite promise that shortly we shall have an Army based solely upon volunteering.

There are those in this country—and no doubt some in Congress—who believe in impressed military service. They believe in conscription. They believe that the young men of the country should be taken in time of peace as well as in war, and impressed into the military branches. The Army believes in that policy, say what it will as to its desire for volunteers. To me the conclusion is inescapable that the Army leaders believe in the draft, because under such a system they can select the men they want to place in the service. They want the very best men they can get. Men in the Army are interested, first, in their corps. They feel that the first duty of a citizen, from their viewpoint, is in the armed service. All the other aspects of national life are subservient to that end. That is a natural feeling.

There is no sounder proof of what I say on this subject than the quiet, unobtrusive order which was issued by the General Staff of the Army on March 8 of this year, raising the passing grade in the mental qualification test from 59 to 70. In other words, when a volunteer is taken into the Army, instead of passing at a grade of 59, he must pass with a grade of 70.

What was the result? The result was that many men who wanted to volunteer were prevented from volunteering. We fought a war on the basis of a passing grade of 59. Men who passed with such a grade were first-rate fighting men. Yet when we are creating a peacetime Army we find the passing grade raised from 59 to 70.

The Army wants the pick of the land. It does not want to consult the individual American citizen as to whether or not he wishes to serve. They themselves are going to say, "We want you, and you must come in, if you can make a grade of 70 on the test."

Mr. President, as I have said, prior to the draft, the soldiers who volunteered into the Army of the United States were accepted if they could make a mark of 59. That was the passing mark, and on that basis we had a good Army, although a small one, and on that basis we fought the war. But now in peacetime the passing mark has been raised to 70. That indicates that the Army itself wants to conduct the draft in such a way that it can select men and pick men, regardless of whether in this free country they wish to serve. That situation does not go to the question of the defenses of America. No one wants those defenses more strongly manned than I do. But it does point out very clearly the attitude of the Army that, first and above everything else in America and its national life, the men are to be selected for military service on the basis of the Army's plan.

Mr. President, I wish to read from the hearings in regard to that point, when it was called to the attention of the representatives of the Army. At the hearing before the Committee on Military Affairs on April 8, 1946, the following

occurred when General Eisenhower was being questioned:

Senator REVERCOMB. General, while we are on the question of a voluntary Army and Navy, particularly the Army, in which I am very much interested, in the voluntary force—and you have definitely expressed the view that you would rather have a volunteer Army—

General EISENHOWER. That is correct.

Senator REVERCOMB. I believe we had total enlistments up to March 21 of 652,000?

General EISENHOWER. That is approximately correct.

Senator REVERCOMB. That is the last figure we have. Now, I have been informed, and I want to clarify, that a test is given, has been given for those brought into the Army, either by draft or through enlistment, known as the Army competency test.

General EISENHOWER. That is correct.

General Paul interposed to say that the name of it was "general classification."

Then General Eisenhower said:

Army general classification test.

Then the following occurred:

Senator REVERCOMB. And up until a short time ago the passing mark was 59; is that correct?

General EISENHOWER. That is correct, sir; something like that. It has been raised 10 points.

Senator REVERCOMB. It was raised about a month ago to 70?

General EISENHOWER. It was raised 10 points.

Senator REVERCOMB. To 69? Would you rather I addressed these questions to General Paul?

General EISENHOWER. For these exact statistics; yes.

Senator REVERCOMB. May I do so at this time, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Then I proceeded to question General Paul, and the questions and answers which I shall read now will show what was done with respect to raising the passing mark for the general classification test:

Senator REVERCOMB. General Paul, the classification test has been given throughout the war, hasn't it?

General PAUL. Yes, sir.

Senator REVERCOMB. And the passing mark was 59?

General PAUL. That is correct.

Senator REVERCOMB. About 1 month ago it was raised to 69?

General PAUL. That is correct.

Senator REVERCOMB. And that was raised while we were in this program of taking in volunteers?

General PAUL. Also correct.

Mr. President, I am advised that it is not correct that the passing mark has been changed to 69. It is 70; it has been raised from 59 to 70.

I then asked:

Will not the raising of that passing mark definitely prevent a certain number of men from volunteering who desire to volunteer into the armed services?

The following strange reply was made:

We hope it will.

Then this occurred:

Senator REVERCOMB. It was done for that purpose?

General PAUL. Yes, sir. We are getting more of the lower grade men than we can use in the Army.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Was the passing mark for the test raised in the same way for the men who were taken in under the draft?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I do not know; I cannot answer that question. I am advised that that test was not given to the men who entered the service under the draft. Whether that is correct, I do not know. I hope I can be advised about it before this debate is over. But I know that volunteers were taken in at first on the basis of a passing mark of 59. Men were taken in on that basis all during the war. The men who fought the war were admitted on that basis. But after March 8, after volunteering had increased to such an extent, the Army raised the passing mark to 70, and General Paul has said that it was raised to stop some of them from coming in.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Can the Senator explain what the difference would be between a mark of 59 and a mark of 70 on the test, and what percentage of volunteers would be kept out by the change in the passing mark, and whether the present test is a much more difficult one?

Mr. REVERCOMB. It is a mental test. The men are asked certain questions to test their mental aptitude. Under the former standard, those who got a mark of 59 on the test were accepted. But now a passing mark of 70 is required.

I cannot say what number would be kept out under the new requirement, except I am informed that at one camp it eliminated a substantial number of the men who went there to volunteer. I do know that volunteering dropped off from approximately 20,000 a week to 14,000 a week immediately after the issuance of the new order.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator from West Virginia permit the Senator from South Dakota to place in the RECORD at this point, if he has the information, a statement regarding whether the changed passing-mark requirement applies to those who are drafted, as well as to those who volunteer, and what the new passing-mark requirement really means in respect to the enlistment program?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I shall be very glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, let me say that I hold in my hand the examination given by the War Department, as alluded to by the Senator from West Virginia. In this examination there are 50 questions. A great number of the questions—17 of them, in fact—are based on pictures or drawings of piles of blocks, which run in number from 4 to possibly 30 in a pile. In order to obtain a passing mark the men have to count the number of

blocks and circle the figure that indicates the correct answer, under the picture of the blocks.

As I have said, there are 50 questions. In order to pass and obtain a grade of 70, the men have to answer only 15 of the questions correctly.

I do not know that it is possible to have the entire examination printed in the RECORD, because it is not customary to print pictures or illustrations in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. However, I may say that the questions leave no doubt that anyone with even a third-grade, fourth-grade, or fifth-grade education would have no difficulty in answering correctly more than 15 of the questions.

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, I believe it will be proper to request unanimous consent that the examination, except the illustrations, be printed in the RECORD, including all the other questions which relate to grammar and many other subjects. I so request at this time.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLASSIFICATION TEST R1—WAR DEPARTMENT,
THE ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE

Name _____
Date _____
Induction station _____
Score _____

PRACTICE QUESTIONS

You have 15 minutes to do the practice questions and the test.

This is a test of your knowledge of words and your ability to think accurately and quickly.

There are three different kinds of exercises. Some are easy and others are difficult. No one is expected to get them all right.

After each question or exercise are four answers. You are to select the one you think is correct and draw a circle around it.

Here are examples of the three different kinds of questions you will be asked.

1. To chase is to follow raise carry sit.
Only one of the four words is correct. The correct word is "follow," so a circle has been drawn around it.

Here is an example for you to do.
2. To reply is to make do answer come.
Decide which of the four words is correct and draw a circle around it.

You should have drawn a circle around the word "answer."

3. How many are 6 cans of tobacco and 7 cans of tobacco? 15 17 13 11.

Add 6 and 7 together and you get 13 for the answer. One of the four answers is 13 so a circle has been drawn around it.

Now do the next problem.
4. Three men caught 81 fish. If each man took one-third of the catch, how many fish would each man have? 17 21 23 27.

Divide 81 by 3 to find the number of fish each man has; find that number among the four answers and draw a circle around it.

You should have drawn a circle around 27.

Another kind of question is to count the number of boxes in a drawing. In each drawing the boxes are all of the same size and shape. The question is, "How many boxes are there?" Count all the boxes including those that are hidden. Here are examples.

5. How many boxes? 2 3 5 4.
There are 4 boxes in the drawing so the number 4 is circled.

Do the next problem yourself.

6. How many boxes? 6 7 8 5.
Count the number of boxes and circle the right answer. You should have circled the number 8.

Here are some more questions. There are four answers after each question. Find the

right one and draw a circle around it. Go right ahead. Work quickly but accurately.

1. Violent means most nearly modern dead fierce better.

2. A decoration means most nearly debt desire condition ornament.

3. Punctual means late tardy prompt slow.

4. Some rounds of ammunition were divided equally among 7 men. Each man received 6 rounds. How many rounds of ammunition were divided? 19 37 42 49.

5. Mr. Williams took out an \$3,000 life insurance policy. The rate was \$25 per \$1,000. What was the annual premium on this policy? \$280 \$290 \$200 \$210.

6. Six men went on a trip by automobile. The total expense was \$13.44, which was shared equally. How much was each man's share of the total expense? \$2.24 \$2.56 \$2.92 \$3.24.

7. How many boxes? 1 4 11 15 16.

8. How many boxes? 18 24 19 27.

9. How many boxes? 20 19 21 15.

10. Indecision means most nearly doubt courage fancy assertion.

11. Dilapidated means most nearly ruined finished retained carved.

12. To drill is to bore wash line mail.

13. A man bought $5\frac{1}{2}$ pounds of meat at 10 cents per pound. How much did the meat cost? $15\frac{1}{2}$ cents 55 cents 52 cents $4\frac{1}{2}$ cents.

14. Tom spends 45 cents a day for lunch. Fred spends 38 cents a day for lunch. How much more does Tom spend than Fred for lunches in a working week of 5 days? 15 cents 22 cents 29 cents 35 cents.

15. A man attended target practice 9 times. He scored 189 in all. What was his average score for each time? 18 21 24 27.

16. How many boxes? 15 9 18 12.

17. How many boxes? 16 26 40 32.

18. How many boxes? 10 8 15 12.

19. Age means most nearly person school bread time.

20. To contradict is to deny admit reveal suspect.

21. To spurt is to talk reduce live gush.

22. At the rate of 9 miles in 15 minutes, how far will a tank go in an hour? 6 miles 24 miles 36 miles 135 miles.

23. A baseball team wishes to buy uniforms for its members. The total cost of the uniforms will be \$52 but there is only \$25 in the treasury. The nine regulars of the team decide to share the balance of the expense equally. How much will each man have to pay? \$1 \$1.75 \$2.25 \$3.

24. Brown had 9 packages of cigarettes and 4 cans of tobacco. Evans had 7 packages of cigarettes. How many packages of cigarettes did they have together? 20 18 14 16.

25. How many boxes? 15 13 12 10.

26. How many boxes? 22 16 27 24.

27. How many boxes? 20 10 16 12.

28. To plod is to hurry hang teach toil.

29. Premature means most nearly late steep productive early.

30. A query is a school narrative question purse.

31. A property was assessed at \$7,000. The tax rate was \$6 per \$100. How much was the tax on the property? \$355 \$405 \$420 \$500.

32. Mr. Jackson has \$2,000 invested at interest of 3 percent. How much interest does this investment earn him in a year? \$60 \$50 \$40 \$30.

33. An officer in the Army is paid \$4,140 a year. How much is his salary per month? \$345 \$295 \$255 \$385.

34. How many boxes? 7 9 6 10.

35. How many boxes? 10 13 9 14.

36. How many boxes? 25 30 50 42.

37. A neigh is the cry of a sheep goat donkey horse.

38. To convey is to leave carry credit direct.

39. An aperture is an ending opening oracle exercise.

40. The scale on a road map reads 1 inch equals 22 miles. How many miles apart are two towns that are $3\frac{1}{2}$ inches apart on the map? 55 66 77 88.

41. Mr. Wilson has one-fifth of his money in a savings account. The amount of his savings account is \$20. What is the total amount of Mr. Wilson's money? \$20 \$50 \$80 \$100.

42. How much money must be invested at 4 percent interest in order to earn \$5 interest per year? \$125 \$130 \$135 \$140.

43. How many boxes? 17 22 18 21.

44. How many boxes? 9 12 10 13.

45. How many boxes? 14 16 17 15.

46. Concurrent means most nearly rebellious simultaneous capable conscientious.

47. Spontaneous means voluntary unwilling rigid ridiculous.

48. You know the mileage reading at the beginning and at the end of a trip. How would you find out the length of the trip? Add subtract divide multiply.

49. A man has 4 yards of twine. How many packages can he wrap if he uses four-fifths of a yard for each package? 3 4 5 6.

50. At 5 a. m. the thermometer stood at 7° below zero. At noon it stood at 10° above zero. How many degrees has the temperature risen in the 7 hours? 3° 10° 17° 24°.

Mr. GURNEY. I hand the questionnaire to the Senator from West Virginia. He may examine it question by question and observe how simple are the questions. I am sure he will agree with me that to answer correctly only 15 answers out of the 50 would be a comparatively easy matter.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, the point I make is that the same qualifying test was given to men during World War II when they were being taken into the armed forces in order to face the enemy and fight the battles of our country. On the basis of the same test, a passing mark of 59 admitted a man into the Army. Now, when there is no fighting to be done, and when the test of a man's mentality is to be ascertained, he is to be required to come into the Army on a passing grade of 70. Men who attained a grade of 110 on the same test during the war were admitted to officers' training school, and there is not a great margin between 70 and 110. So the point system has been raised with regard to admitting men into the Army during peacetime. The passing grade now is 70. The military wants picked men. It does not want volunteers when it precludes them by raising the point system.

Mr. GURNEY. I believe that if all of the questions were answered correctly the grade would be 162; 59 is equal to about a fourth-grade education, and 70 is equal to about a fifth-grade education.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I have some figures before me which came from authentic sources. They show that in February 1946, 36 percent of the enlistments were in the fourth group, and that 9 percent of the enlistments were in the fifth or last group, or a total of 45 percent, as opposed to wartime, when 27 percent of the enlistments were in the fourth group and 5 percent were in the fifth group. Now, with a reduced Army and increased specialists with airplane train-

ing, and with tanks and all the modern equipment of an army, it seems to me that it would be dangerous not to have the Army increase its tests if we are going to reduce the numbers in the Army and give them increased individual responsibilities.

Mr. REVERCOMB. There would be great force in the Senator's argument if the entire Army were made up of airplanes and special equipment. But the Senator knows that we still have foot soldiers, and that the size of the Army is to be based on the idea of it being necessary to guard surplus goods, and that thousands of men in the Army today are used as guards. If the men could fight the war on the basis of a passing mark of 59, they could be taken into the service as peacetime soldiers on the same basis. General Paul said that the purpose of raising the passing grade was to keep men out of the Army.

Mr. President, it is inescapable that the War Department wants to select and therefore to have selective-service maintained, and it will have ready the same arguments to put forward a year from now. The Army wants to pick and select its men. That is a very natural position for the Army to take. It is proud of its corps. It wants to pick the top of the citizenship—a very natural policy on its part. But the question arises, Mr. President, is the Congress of the United States, which has the duty of fixing national policy in all its phases, going to surrender completely to the ideas of the Army? The Army looks at only one phase of national life. We, as Members of the Congress, must look at every aspect of national life. We will consider the needs of the Army from the standpoint of enabling it to maintain its strength, but we will not surrender completely to the right which it claims of picking the youth of the country and adopting methods of enforced service which have prevailed in Europe for a long time.

No man has higher praise for the Army than I. The personnel of the Army, from its Chief of Staff down to the private soldier, is entitled to the praise of every American citizen. It met foreign enemies and vanquished them. It protected and sustained us during the days of war. We feel deeply grateful, and we should never forget what the Army did. Surely, I would say that the Congress has not, nor have the people, failed to acknowledge their gratitude. It should be everlasting, and should be shown in a material way. But even after such acknowledgment, Mr. President, shall the Army leaders of our country be allowed to fix our national policy, or shall the Congress, upon whom the duty devolves, fix the policy of whether or not we shall continue with enforced military service?

In the main, the bill now before the Senate, as reported by the Military Affairs Committee, is substantially the Army's bill. I realize that those who will follow without question the Army's demands upon this subject, and those who so devotedly believe in enforced military service, regardless of need, are beyond the reach of any argument, and cannot be influenced by any argument

which I or any other Senator may make upon the subject.

On the other hand, Mr. President, there are those who, in consonance with our ideas of freedom, feel that enforced service, unless it is needed for the protection of this country, is not the best for America. To those, I would make my argument today. It is to the people of our country and to the Members of the Senate that I would respectively present my amendment in the form of a substitute, with confidence in the belief that it will lead them to the conclusion that further enforced service in the Army is not at all necessary in order to return to this country the unmarried men and fathers who have had foreign service.

As I have said, we have accepted the Army's figure without question, although it has never been probed or delved into. No attempt has been made to substantiate it. Representatives of the Army came before the Military Affairs Committee and said, "We want so many men," and then stated where they wanted them, and explained the purposes for which they wanted them. Among those purposes was that of guarding surplus property. The figure which is asked for as of July 1, 1946, is 1,550,000. The figure as of July 1, 1947, a year hence, is 7,070,000. It will be noted that the top figure is for July 1, 1946, and then grades down to July 1, 1947, by approximately 500,000 less.

I point out, Mr. President, some figures of the size of the Army at this time so we will know whether or not it is necessary to continue drafting. The strength of the Army, estimated as of May 20, 1946, is 1,960,000, many of whom ought to have been released a long time ago, many of whom have had extended service. The total—and bear this figure in mind at the moment—the total volunteer enlistments to May 21, 1946, were 769,340.

Mr. President, I have before me the testimony of the Chief of Staff, the respected General Eisenhower, given before the Military Affairs Committee during its hearings on January 16, 17, and 18. On page 355 there is set forth a table showing the employment of the Army overseas as of July 1, 1946. This is the plan and these are the figures of the number of men employed—the maximum figures, the figures fixed by the Army, not the figures of anyone else, but the Army's demand, the Army's request. The number of men who are to be used overseas in all theaters as of July 1, 1946, is 794,000.

Mr. President, the Army says that it will have a volunteer force on July 1, 1946, of 950,000 men. We know that it will have that number. We know that with 769,340 volunteer enlisted men at this time plus the 150,000 officers in service, every man who has been inducted into the Army and drafted and who was overseas can be brought home and his place filled by a volunteer, because only 794,340 are needed overseas.

If the Army is going to need only 794,000 overseas in both European, Pacific, and the other areas and they will have 950,000 volunteers by July 1, 1946, there is no need for a man who is not a volunteer to be abroad on July 1, or shortly

thereafter, of this year. Those facts, those figures, are inescapable.

I know the appeal to the Senate when any committee comes forth with a bill. I know that to oppose a committee bill is an uphill task, but I invite the attention of the Senate to the actual facts and figures, figures furnished by the Army, as to whether or not the continuance of the draft can be justified. Every boy who was drafted and who is overseas today could be returned and a volunteer put in his place overseas under the figures given by the Chief of Staff himself, and there would be left in this country more than 150,000 volunteers after filling the needs of the overseas calls. Yet we talk about extending the draft. For what?

There is every reason to extend the selective-service law. In addition to the reasons already given, we are told that the international situation is such that we must remain strong; we must be ready for military calls. Mr. President, if we let the draft stay in effect without induction, every boy on becoming 18 years of age will register. He will be subject to call overnight when Congress says it is ready to call him. As described by another Senator, it will be as a loaded gun behind the door, ready to be picked up when the time of battle comes. But why induct men today of any age, when they are not needed, as plainly shown by the facts?

Now let me turn, Mr. President, to some other figures. These, too, are figures furnished by the Army. The Army has estimated that its entire personnel, both officers and enlisted men, who will be volunteers on July 1, 1946, will be 950,000. In addition to that figure, the Congress has authorized the creation of a corps known as the Philippine Scouts, of 50,000. No doubt whatsoever has been expressed that the 50,000 enlistments will be obtained.

Here is an additional interesting figure: There were inducted into the Army of the United States under the Selective Service from January 1, 1945, to May 1, 1946, 927,874 men. The total of those figures would be 1,927,874, made up of volunteers and men inducted into the Army with 18 months of service as of July 1, 1946.

I realize that we cannot figure on the whole 927,874, because, doubtless, some of those men were casualties in the war. We cannot take it wholly because some of the men who were inducted in that period enlisted for a definite period. But I may say that taking one-half of them—and certainly that is a liberal consideration toward the Army's viewpoint—there will be in the service as of July 1, 1946, 1,463,937 men who are volunteers and who have had only 18 months' experience.

There is no reason today, Mr. President, even if we disregard the figures of the Chief of Staff about those who serve abroad, why every boy who has had 18 months' service should not be on his way back home. The substitute amendment calls for the return of those men.

This proposal is not made because of any sentimental reasons or any desire to relieve men from duties which they should perform. I submit to the Senate

that it is based upon the actual facts and figures of the War Department which cannot be refuted.

I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Army, under its own plan, as of May 20, 1946, has one-million-nine-hundred-and-some-thousand men. It wants an Army of 1,550,000 July the first, and it will have them, because it has them now. Under its plan it will have 1,070,000 men, reduced by 500,000 from that date, on July 1, 1947. Why is there a desire to continue the draft when we consider the voluntary enlistments as they are now proceeding? Mr. President, I can see no reason for it. I cannot see it sustained in the facts and the figures which are presented to us.

Ah, the Army wants it, of course. As I have pointed out, the Army wants to select the men it puts into its service. I care not how many volunteers we were getting today, and I care not how many we get a year from now, the Army will request the right to select those who serve. But are we, Mr. President, who make the policies of this country, with the knowledge we have of the facts, going to ignore every other phase of national life and follow the Army blindly?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to ask a question along that particular line. On page 2 of Senate bill 2057, as reported, there is a provision which places the number of men in the Army on July 1 of this year as not exceeding 1,550,000.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is in my amendment also.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then it shall be reduced consistently month by month so that the Army strength on the 1st of July 1947 shall be 1,070,000.

This is the provision to which I wish to call attention:

And provided further, That the monthly requisitions on the President under this act by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall not exceed the number of men required after consideration of the actual number of voluntary enlistments during the 3 months preceding that month in which the requisition is made.

If the President should follow this measure, how could the Army require men under the Selective Service Act if, under the voluntary system, it was getting a sufficient number to fill the requirements?

Mr. REVERCOMB. The law says, I point out to the able Senator, that the President shall act upon the call of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy or monthly requisitions on the President. He does not make any decision about it, the decision is made by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy. I know that if it is left up to the Army, or the War Department, to determine whether or not there shall be calls for drafts, we can be certain there will be calls for drafts.

Mr. FERGUSON. If the Senator will yield for another question, in line 10, the bill as reported says:

The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall not exceed the number of men required after consideration of the actual

number of voluntary enlistments during the 3 months preceding that month in which the requisition is made.

How can the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, under this proposal, make a greater call than is required by the law?

Mr. REVERCOMB. They will themselves determine what persons, what individuals, qualify under the voluntary enlistments. I do not want to leave that question open when I see the War Department raise the qualification from 59 to 70. I do not know when they will raise it to 100 or 110.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then, the Senator's answer to the question would be that he is of the opinion that the number of men who will be selected under voluntary enlistments will be reduced, so that there will always be a call for men under the selective service unless Congress forbids it?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I think the matter should be placed entirely in the hands of Congress. I feel it is the duty of Congress to act in this situation, since we can get the men, and require the Army to go about getting volunteers; and if they cannot get them, then let the Congress act to start inductions again. In other words, rather than say to the War Department, "We are going to let you have the say so about when you will stop selective service, and we will say nothing about it. We hand over to you the whole power and you will say when selective service and induction shall stop," I want the Congress to say, "We stop them now. Go out and get your volunteer Army. Be earnest about this, and get your volunteer force, and if you cannot do it, then we will start inductions again."

Mr. FERGUSON. Would not a fair interpretation of the bill reported by the Senate committee, if it is followed fairly and with the spirit of its language, be that the Army would not be allowed to call for men under the selective service if they were getting the volunteers?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I prefer the other method, of the Congress stopping it, and when the Congress finds they cannot get volunteers to fill the forces up to the number contained in the amendment, as well as in the bill, let inductions start again under the act of Congress.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I share the Senator's optimism about the volunteers, as he well knows. I do not completely concur in the conclusions he states, and the conclusions which he has reached in the substitute which he has proposed for the bill. Nevertheless, I do concur with him in believing that volunteers can be obtained.

But there is one thing which should be called to the attention of the Senate and to the attention of the country. It is rather remarkable to learn the number of volunteers the armed forces have received, inasmuch as the Government of the United States is paying them to stay out of the Army. What I mean by that is that we have the employment-compensation provision now in force.

I talked with the Veterans' Administration this morning, and I was surprised to find that for the week ending May 25 the United States Treasury paid out \$32,793,045 in unemployment compensation, \$20 a week, which is \$80 a month we are paying men not to go in the service.

Furthermore, we are paying out now \$2,000,000 a week in self-employment compensation. That is, if a man on a farm or in a little business does not earn \$100 a month, he is entitled to self-employment compensation. That amount has been growing, from \$1,000,000 a month to more than \$10,000,000 a month, and every month it is increasing. So of course the veteran who would otherwise go back into the Army, under ordinary circumstances, is being paid by the Government to stay out of the Army, paid more to stay out than he would be paid if he went back in.

Therefore I say, in view of that situation, in view of the fact that 1,639,652 men received unemployment compensation in the week ending May 25, and 40,000 received self-employment compensation in the same week, it is rather surprising that we are getting the number of volunteers we are getting.

I presume we will have to wait until the 52 weeks are up, and when that period is ended, perhaps many of the men will go back into the service. As that compensation decreases, as it is bound to do in the months ahead, I think we have every right to believe that enlistments will increase, and increase very rapidly.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator very much for his observation, and I agree heartily with him that we can secure the force desired by the Army through volunteering. There is no doubt about that in my mind. Since that is the Army we can obtain by volunteers, and when we already have more than 950,000 volunteers as of July 1, enough to fill every place abroad, under the very statement made by General Eisenhower himself as to the number of soldiers he needed abroad on July 1, 1946, why we should turn to the draft is beyond my comprehension. I share the views expressed by the Senator from Georgia, who said we will never get anywhere with a half-draft and a half-volunteer Army. Not until we suspend the draft, not until we try out fully the volunteer system, which has been so successful up to this point, can we do what is right in maintaining fully an army upon the volunteer basis.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The distinguished Senator from Colorado gave figures respecting unemployment compensation and stated, if I heard him correctly, that at \$80 a month unemployment compensation was more than a private's pay. Of course, those figures do not include keep, which I understand is estimated at approximately \$5 a day or thereabouts. So really we are paying men in the Army more than we are paying those who are now under unemployment compensation, if the keep of a man, his clothes, and so forth, are included.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The clothing, food, and so forth, a soldier receives do amount to something, but many of the unemployed veterans are in their own homes, and their lodging and their food and their upkeep does not mean very much to them. They are receiving, however, \$20 cash each week, or \$80 a month, which is more cash than men receive in the Army.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the Senator on that point.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. In the Army there are a great many deductions, as the Senator knows, out of the \$75, or the \$50, as the pay is at present. If the pending amendment is adopted, of course, it will increase the amount, but \$50 is the amount of pay at present in the Army, and \$80 a month is the compensation paid to keep men out of the Army.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with what the Senator has stated. I thought, however, that in order to make the statement complete the item of keep and other allowances should be added to what the Senator said.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I desire to point out that from the beginning the War Department has not had very great faith in the volunteer system, and I want to support that statement by the testimony of those who have testified before the Military Affairs Committee upon this subject. The testimony shows that their belief in a volunteer force was very weak. As I have said, they want a selective service of men in which they can pick them.

On September 12, 1945, just a month after the fall of Japan, it was estimated by the Secretary of War that 300,000 was the number of men who would volunteer in the Army by July 1, 1946. I refer the Senate to page 18 of the hearings had on September 12, 1945. That is the estimate which the Secretary made. Let us see what occurred. The volunteers started coming in, and then, Mr. President, on January 16, 1946, the estimate was made by General Paul, who is known as G-1, that is Chief of Personnel of the Staff of the Army, that there would be enlisted in the Army as volunteers by July 1, 1946, 650,000 men. In September the estimate was 300,000 men, and in January the estimate was 650,000 men. Then on April 3, 1946, the Secretary of War estimated that there would be 800,000 volunteers. Of course, they had to change their opinion because the volunteers were coming in. I give these figures to show that when they were estimating what would be the prospect for the future they indicated little faith in the volunteer system. They did not think much of it. They did not think it would work.

Mr. President, it has worked. Not only will there be 800,000 volunteer enlisted men in the Army on July 1, 1946, plus 150,000 officers, but I say that there will be a considerably greater number than 800,000 enlisted men, even with the slow-down in the draft which has been

mentioned. So, Mr. President, with that situation, and with the continued reduction of the Army up to July 1, 1947, why must we at this time continue to induct men into the services when it is shown that the volunteer system will take care of the Army's needs?

We have had discussions here about taking care of our obligations and commitments. Of course, a complete answer to the taking care of our obligations and commitments is the fact that an Army of 1,550,000 men as of July this year and an Army of 1,070,000 men as of July next year is the figure fixed by the Army itself to take care of those commitments. Nobody questions that. We have not even delved into it. But certainly the Army is going to give the top figure it needs. It is not going to underestimate. The Army has never been guilty of that. There are a sufficient number of men to take care of any commitments, as is shown by the statements made by Army representatives before the committee.

Mr. President, what are the commitments? Apparently they are quite numerous. I was interested in a statement made by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] a couple of days ago in which he spoke of a subcommittee's report to the United Nations Council in which the subcommittee found that the government in Spain was a threat to world peace. With all respect to that subcommittee, its report that Spain is a threat to the world peace is to me absurd. With whom is Spain going to fight? What country is Spain going to pick on? If the United Nations is going into a country, out of some feeling against its internal government, if someone who has power in the United Nations does not like the government in Spain or in some other country and is going to send troops into that country, I do not want our boys to be drafted for that purpose. I do not want to draft American boys to march into Spain to upset Spain's government. I am not interested in that. If that is one of the commitments, then I am not very much in favor of using the young men and the blood of this country to carry out such a commitment as that. I thought this Government had had enough of that policy when the State Department went into the elections in the Argentine and tried to take part in them, and received as sound a trouncing as any set of men got in their lives. I thought that certainly the Government had learned forever and severely a lesson there. We may not like what is in the government of some other country; we may not like, and I do not like personally, what is done in other governments when we view them from the outside; but we would resent very much, and certainly we should, the attempt on the part of any other government to interfere with our elections, or to interfere with us because it thought we did not have the right kind of government for our people. In fairness we ought to adopt the same attitude toward other countries. I do not want any such commitments as that upheld with the lives of American boys. Also, I do not

want to draft boys to take part in a civil war in China.

We talk about commitments. I do not know what they are, and I doubt if any Member of the Senate knows all the commitments our Government may have made; but whatever they are, so far as the armed forces are concerned, that argument is answered by the call of the Army itself. In this bill we are giving to the Army the number of men it has asked for.

We are told that one of the reasons for raising this Army is to guard surplus property abroad. Mr. President, I do not feel that we are justified in drafting men in their twenties, or men in their teens, and requiring them to withdraw from the lives they want to lead, in order to guard surplus property. We can only justify drafting them in time of war, when we are faced with an enemy and when our national security is threatened. But I do not believe that we are justified, in time of peace, in going into the civil life of the people of our country and having the Army tap young men on the shoulder and say, "You go over to Korea or somewhere else to guard surplus property." Today in those lands we are employing many civilians, and they could be used to guard surplus property, under the direction of the Army.

In connection with the subject of surplus property, recently the Senate passed a bill providing for the sale of our surplus property anywhere on the face of the earth in exchange for the currency of the country in which it is located. If that will not dispose of surplus property abroad, nothing will. If the property is to be sold, why talk about drafting men to care for surplus property abroad? I do not think it is justified.

Moreover, the Senate has passed the British loan. A great deal of surplus property is located in the British Isles. Under the terms of the British loan agreement, surplus property in the British Isles will be sold to Britain. There will not be anything there belonging to the United States to guard. So I think we should absolutely put out of the picture the idea of drafting men into the armed forces to guard surplus property. I understand that we employ approximately 400,000 civilians in Europe. I was not furnished with the figure for the Pacific, but certainly, so far as guarding surplus property abroad is concerned, a skeleton force of the American Army, with the assistance of civilian employees, could perform that service.

Mr. President, I have argued the question of the necessity of continuing the draft. I make this appeal upon the basis of facts. A great campaign has been carried on for the extension of the draft. The boys in the Army have been told that unless it is extended they cannot come home. I think that is one of the most unjustified and unfair things ever said to the men in the service. They write to me and to other Members of Congress asking that the draft be extended because they have been in the service for 2½ years, 2 years, or 18 months, and that unless the draft is extended they cannot come home. I say that it was a great wrong to tell them that. It was a mean thing to do to tell those boys such a

thing because the fact is that every boy in the service who was not a volunteer can today be brought home.

In his testimony before the Committee on Military Affairs, General Eisenhower himself stated that only 794,000 men would be needed abroad in July 1946. According to the Army's own estimate, we shall have a volunteer Army of 950,000, or 150,000 more than enough to meet our commitments abroad, and we can do it through the volunteer system.

Another interesting thing in connection with the armed forces is that if we are to have 794,000 men abroad—and that is the greatest peacetime army that we have ever had on foreign shores—it is to be part of an army of 1,550,000. That means that on July 1, 1946, we shall have 756,000 men in camps in this country and marching up and down the roads. For what purpose? To have a big Army.

We are going to be entirely fair to the Army. It is entitled to fair treatment. But we can never permit the military to determine the national policies of America. I see no need for 756,000 men in camps in the United States. I accede to the judgment of the Army leaders that 794,000 men are needed abroad on July 1, 1946, to meet the demands and commitments. The Army has fixed that figure. No one has questioned it. But I point out that every place in that force can be filled by a volunteer who is in the Army today, and that the boys abroad who are inductees can be brought home. It is a definite wrong and misleading to say to them that the extension of the draft is necessary to bring them home.

Mr. President, I make this appeal to the Senate after a study of the figures which are before us. During the war I went along with the requests of the Army. I want to sustain the Army. Certainly during the war every member of the Committee on Military Affairs has done so. I want a large Navy. The Navy is meeting its requirements with volunteers. I want a strong Army, and I want it to meet its requirements with volunteers. I want the Army leaders to be earnest about raising a volunteer force. We cannot operate with a force that is half volunteer and half impressed.

I have definitely shown, by figures in the record, that there is no need for further inductions. We have offered a plan which would not wipe out the Selective Service System, but would maintain it in full force. The men who are registered will be subject to call if the Congress sees the national need for it. Under the terms of the amendment which we offer as a substitute for the bill, we will say to the world that the men of this country are registered and ready for call. In addition to those who have seen service, those who become 18 years of age will be registered, and the selective service system will still live, in full force. When the national need requires it, upon the call of the Congress, which is the only body of our Government which should act on this subject, inductions may be started again. That is a fair measure. It is sustained by the facts and figures; and I submit that it is sustained in right and reason. It is sustained unless the Government of these United States desires to have impressed service continued, be-

cause the same reasons put forward today for the extension of inductions can be put forward a year hence and perhaps 2 years hence.

So, Mr. President, I urge upon the Senate the serious consideration of the substitute measure. I hope it will be adopted. I appeal to the Senate to place our armed services upon a voluntary basis, and to end enforced and impressed service when it is no longer needed. It is no longer needed now.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUFFMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield for a question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yesterday the Senate adopted an amendment which would increase quite substantially the pay of the men in the lower ranks in the Army and Navy. The idea behind the adoption of that amendment was to increase the number of volunteers.

The measure now before the Senate calls for volunteers to fill all possible places, and for inductees under the Selective Service System to be used only if it is absolutely necessary to use them. However, the world is still at war. We have many of our boys in foreign countries. We have commitments in foreign countries; we have commitments to the United Nations.

The distinguished Senator from West Virginia says, "Let us end inductions now." Mr. President, I ask the Senator whether it is not better, in his opinion, to play safe and secure for one more year, because a year from now conditions may be greatly different from those at this time, rather than at the present time to take the chance of relying completely on the volunteer system, which we hope will be sufficient. In short, is it not better to keep the induction system on the statute books as a form of additional security?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I say to the Senator that not only am I in favor of keeping the United States secure now and for the next year, but I am in favor of keeping the United States secure in its military forces from now on. But I think the question is entirely aside from that point. We are in agreement on having a strong force.

My point is that in order to obtain a strong force it is not necessary to draft men. It is not necessary to continue in service those who have had 18 months of service. I have tried to point that out.

The question is, Does the Senate prefer to have an impressed Army rather than one made up of volunteers who will serve for short periods?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I would answer that question by saying that, of course, we want a volunteer Army, and we wish to be sure that our country is safe and that we live up to our obligations in time of war.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me ask the Senator a question. Does he doubt that General Eisenhower is just as much interested as we are in having the United States live up to its obligations? Certainly he is. When he puts the top

figure for the Army at 1,550,000 and when he says he wishes to have only 794,000 of our men abroad to carry out our obligations there—and that is where we have our obligations—and when under the Army's own plan as of July 1 there are volunteers to the number of 950,000, why keep abroad the ones who are not volunteers? Why not bring them back to this country? Why not let the volunteer Army take care of our obligations to others, about which the Senator from Massachusetts has spoken? I wish to have that done. I am not questioning the necessity of doing it. But I say let us use the volunteer force we have. The Army's own figures show that we can replace with a volunteer every inductee who is abroad.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. According to the statement of the War Department, they have in the service at the present time over 400,000 boys more than they said they would need as of July 1, 1946. Is not that true?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Approximately so, as of May 20, 1946.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. They are going to have to let them out mighty fast, to get down to that number. Is not that true?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We have already adopted an amendment providing for a 50-percent pay boost.

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Gallup poll stated, as of May 10 of this year, that if we were to adopt a 50-percent pay boost, 23 percent of the boys who were in the service would wish to reenlist.

So if they went back into the service, that would make a force of approximately 2,000,000 boys; and over the next year, let us say, it certainly would give us more than the 1,070,000 which the Army has said it will need as of July 1, 1947. Is not that true?

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is correct. I say to the Senator that every fact brought out by the War Department itself, on the basis of the figures it presented when it reached the point of presenting us with figures, sustains the Senator's position that we can have a volunteer force without resorting to further inductions.

On the basis of the figures just referred to by the Senator from South Carolina, we know we shall have more than 1,500,000 men on July 1. And when we accept the plan that the number will be down to 1,070,000 a year thereafter, why must we continue to induct men into the service, when there is every promise of having a sufficient number of volunteers or perhaps even more volunteers than the Army will take?

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the substitute proposal which is before the Senate seems to me to be properly interpreted, in part, as calling for a reconsideration of the action which the Senate has taken in adopting the amendment providing for continuation of the draft. As the bill stands at the present time, we have adopted an amendment which provides

for a very material increase in pay, on induction. That has properly been called incentive pay for volunteering. As the measure now stands, the draft provisions are held in readiness to be used in case the incentive pay provision is not effective and the volunteer system does not bring in a sufficient number of men for the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and so forth.

Various degrees of optimism have been expressed as to the effect of these increases in pay. We have fairly authoritative figures to show about what the results of the volunteer system are right now, and they are not particularly encouraging. Any optimism must rest in part upon the effect of the 50-percent pay increase which now is to be offered to men upon volunteering.

Mr. President, I am unable to share very much optimism regarding the effect of that measure. The Government will be committed to pay out nearly a half billion dollars every year in this experiment. A half billion dollars is, of course, going to buy some volunteers, but I do not believe that we shall achieve great results from that very considerable yearly expenditure. I would not presume to put forward my own unsupported opinion in regard to a subject of such great importance, but it happens, Mr. President, that there is available a very considerable wealth of experience on the point. It does not show that the Government can really buy volunteers into the service in considerable numbers. That experience was gained during the years between the two wars, and previous thereto.

Almost any recruiting officer who has gained experience in that field, and who has from day to day inquired into the motives of the young men who present themselves for enlistment, reaches the conclusion that the reason men come to the recruiting station is mainly because of an urge to go somewhere, going somewhere from where they have been. It is a perfectly natural urge. It has been manifested in many ways throughout the ages. The young men do not think very much about the money part of it; in fact, they have been found to think very little about it, insofar as it relates to the immediate return which they may receive when they put on the uniform.

Whenever they can do so, and that is most of the time, the recruiting officers interview the applicants in order to ascertain what is in their minds. It has been found that the applicants do distinctly have an urge to go out from where they are. It has been repeatedly the experience that when recruiting officers are located next door to each other, a recruit who wishes to be a soldier first walks into the marine recruiting station. There may be various reasons why the marines are his first choice. But the main reason is that the applicant thinks that if he joins the marines he will go to more places than if he joins the Army. His belief, of course, is correct.

So far as the pay for the first few months is concerned—which, of course, is all that he is definitely promised—the recruit looks upon it as spending money, as cigarette money. It is quite true that many recruits think further ahead than

that, and those who do look ahead and who have ambitions are usually the best of the day's group, and frequently inquire into what is ahead for them. They want to know what, if they make good in what they are about to do, they will receive afterwards beyond the \$30, \$40, \$50, or \$75 a month which they are paid when they enter the service. That means a great deal, because they are the ones who may think of service in the armed services as a profession. They will be the career men. It is from such men that eventually forms the group which really constitutes the bones, the motor nerves, and, in large part, brains of any armed organization. I refer to the officers, both commissioned and non-commissioned, and the technicians.

Mr. President, any nation which possesses, in sufficient quantity and quality, a corps of all those kinds of officers and technicians is a long distance on the road to having an efficient army. Without it, no country can have a real army, navy, or marine corps in less time than a full generation. If any nation has such a body of men it can within a comparatively short time, fill up the ranks in the lower pay grades which we are considering. With those cadres, and the consequent ability to train men when inducted, and ability to handle all the mechanisms and the various problems which constitute a rather difficult profession, we could soon have an army or a navy, even if the ranks had to be filled with recruits.

Mr. President, yesterday the Senate adopted a substitute amendment for the amendment which was offered by the Senator from South Dakota. I refer to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado and by the Senator from Wisconsin. Either of the two amendments would require about the same total outlay from the Treasury, or, in other words, an amount approaching a half billion dollars. There was a basic difference between the two amendments. Under the amendment which was proposed by the Senator from South Dakota who has charge of the bill, somewhat more than 40 percent of the proposed increase, totaling a half billion dollars, was to go to the personnel of that cadre to whom I have referred, consisting of commissioned and noncommissioned officers and technicians; nearly 60 percent of the total expenditure would go to the lower-paid grades. The substitute, if adopted, will give the entire amount to the privates and lowest grades of non-commissioned officers.

In my opinion, Mr. President, the Nation would have obtained its full money's worth had it adopted the Gurney amendment, as approximately 40 percent of the money would have gone to the career officers and enlisted men of the armed forces. That would have resulted in better quality, though no change in numbers.

After all, Mr. President, career men become such and can be called such only after long training and considerable service of many years which takes them even perhaps beyond middle life. When they follow such a course they naturally expect to lead as normal lives as possible, and raise families. They necessarily must have sufficient money with which

to support their families, and achieve some degree of security for them. To that category of the personnel the Government must pay, and by paying and thereby obtaining quality, the Government gets its money's worth.

As I have already said, I myself have grave doubt that the half billion dollars which it is proposed to expend by way of increased compensation in the lower grades of the armed services year after year, will yield the returns which are looked for. I do not feel that the return in the way of building a strong Army will be anywhere near comparable to our anticipations. I do not believe that the increase under the substitute amendment will yield as much benefit as would the 40-percent increase proposed by the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota.

I am unable to support the pending substitute amendment, because I do not see my way clear to taking the chance it involves. It means a gamble. We have won the war, but we still have to win the peace; we shouldered the commitments imposed upon the Army and the Navy, and which have been in no way disputed. Indeed, as a matter of fact, it has been represented that they are minimum commitments. We will be gambling if we accept the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia. In the face of the situation which confronts us, I think the adoption of the substitute amendment would entail a step with which I am unable to go along.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I desire merely to make a short observation along the lines of the Senator's talk in connection with the pay schedule. I do not need to call it to the Senator's attention, I am sure, but we must look into the future when we consider pay schedules in the Army, because, I am sure, the Senator in his position and the position he has held during his life as a member of our armed forces, knows that in peacetime, when we get away from the spendthrift period we are now in, it will be very hard to keep up the kind of armed forces we need. With the excessively high costs of maintaining the armed forces it is quite possible the Congress will be pressured to the point where it will not be able to make the appropriations necessary to maintain the number needed for our security.

When we have to pay these certainly excessively high wages as compared with what we paid heretofore in our country's history and in comparison with the wages and salaries paid the members of the armed forces of other countries, we are way above the top.

Of course I am glad to associate myself with the Senator's remarks about the necessity for taking care of the backbone of the Army and Navy, by giving the right kind of salaries to the chief petty officers and the sergeants in the Army.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from South Dakota, since he has brought into the discussion my former life, that in those circles it is frequently said in connection with the errors which have been made by the Government, and in which the Congress often participates, that they lie in holding down appropriations during peacetimes. Then it is observed that the moment an emergency arises the lid immediately flies off, Congress takes the opposite course, and says, "Well, here is all the money you want; go ahead with it." That has repeatedly happened.

I do not suppose that the Army and the Navy have a very good reputation for economy, and I can see why they do not have. There have been many extravagances, but it is unfair for anyone to think that those who are in positions of influence and who have authority to make decisions in the armed services of the United States never pay any regard whatever to dollars. They do. In the long run they know that, after all, only about so many dollars are going to be made available to put the armed forces in a state of readiness for the common defense and they do think over the problem of what is the best way in which to spend these dollars; in other words, how will they get their money's worth—in what way will they get the most for their money.

The Senator is quite correct in saying that right now it must be true that those in military command, in high places in the armed services, are viewing the recent action of this body in adding to the bill half a billion dollars of pay which will continue year after year, as a measure which will eventually result in sacrifices in some other respects.

Mr. WHERRY obtained the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President—

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yesterday I asked the able Senator in charge of the pending bill to accept an amendment and take it to conference pertaining to the reemployment of veterans. Since yesterday Colonel Renfro, counsel for Selective Training and Service, has suggested language to perfect my amendment, which is acceptable to me, and I hope is acceptable to the Senator from South Dakota. I should like to call up that amendment now pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement which was entered a few minutes ago, and have it acted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado as modified.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In section 7, line 21, it is proposed to delete all provisions of the section after the word "date" and insert in lieu thereof the following:

One day prior to the date of the termination of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, as herein or hereafter specified, all functions, responsibilities, records, and balances of appropriations which have been utilized or are available for use in the administration of the functions of the Personnel Division, established under sec-

tion 8 (g) of such act, of the Selective Service System, shall be transferred to the Veterans' Employment Service of the United States Employment Service.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I should like to state that with the wording of the amendment as just read I not only shall take it to conference but I sincerely hope it will be retained in conference, and I should like to associate myself, if I may, with the Senator from Colorado in offering the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I shall be very glad to have the Senator join me in this amendment. Its purpose is simply to protect the veterans' rights for employment and reemployment under the Selective Training and Service Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. There is no limitation on the debate, is there?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no limitation on debate.

BLACK MARKET IN MEAT

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in a few moments I expect to address myself to the pending business at some length, but prior to doing so I should like to call to the attention of the Senate something about the black market in meat. I do so at this particular time—and I shall take only a few moments—for the reason that some top-flight men have gone before the Committee on Banking and Currency and have requested that price ceilings again be imposed upon meat. I understand that a few days ago the Committee on Banking and Currency decided to take them off, but these men have made their defense on the theory that because of commitments made abroad it is necessary to impose price ceilings in this country, and possibly rationing.

Mr. President, 5 or 6 weeks ago on the floor of the Senate I called the attention of the Members of this body to the fact that nearly 80 percent of the meat being sold to the ultimate consumer originated and was distributed somewhere along the line through the black market. At that time the statement seemed like an exaggerated one, but because of the tremendous increase in black-market meat, the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Anderson, put in a new program—he called it a new control program—with the idea that it might somehow eliminate the black market. The program resolved itself into again establishing meat quotas where the animals are bought in the live markets, and he said then that if that particular program was not successful, he knew no other way except to lift the ceilings and try an uncontrolled program as to meats.

Nearly 6 weeks have elapsed, and I wish to say to the Members of the Senate that the black market in meat is becoming worse and worse. It is now approaching the proportions of a national scandal. It is costing American consumers billions of dollars, for which Mr. Bowles does not account when he testifies before the committees and claims that meat is being sold at the legitimate ceiling prices.

It is causing a meat famine in many consuming areas. I pass through the little town of Presidential Gardens every Friday morning, and see the cars lined up to get meat. Last Friday morning I think the procession was a mile in length, which is an indication that the present program is causing a meat famine in consuming areas.

This bootlegging, which has resulted in an increase of illegal slaughterers from less than 1,600 to more than 26,000, that buy the animals and kill them in every little market, noninspected, is not only a black market to the consumer, but the offal in hides, bones, and grease, and huge quantities of valuable glands and other materials, is wasted. It is a waste which has not been taken into account when the officials testified before the committees relative to ceiling prices. The offal is the sole source of raw material for many vital pharmaceutical products. The black market is causing widespread unemployment. A large percentage of black-market meat, under Federal inspection standards, is wholly unfit for human consumption, and is a serious threat to the public health.

Mr. President, none of those facts is brought out, apparently, when Mr. Bowles appears before the committee and testifies that the only way to control prices is by Federal price control. We are out of control, 80 percent of the meat going black market, and, in addition to that, there is all this waste of the offal which we so badly need not only for chemical supplies, but for 101 other uses. It is an absolute waste, because the animals are killed in the small packing plants, or slaughterhouses, which are black market, which will not even let the people know they are killing. Therefore the offal is not sold, but is wasted.

Today, OPA price ceilings on meat are simply a pure fiction. Enforcement has completely broken down, and, in spite of everything OPA has been able to do, the black market continues to grow steadily.

I wish now to quote what Secretary Anderson testified before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on May 1, 1946. He gave this testimony in answer to a question propounded by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the distinguished majority leader. This is the question asked by the Senator from Kentucky:

Senator BARKLEY. These statements that come to me all head up to the suggestion finally that the way to cure this whole situation in meat is to take off all controls and ceilings, on the theory that meat might run up for 30 days in price, but it would level off, so that there would not be any of this artificial situation. I do not know whether that

is the answer or not. I am seeking the answer.

That is the end of the indirect question propounded by the Senator from Kentucky to the Secretary of Agriculture, Clinton Anderson. This is the reply of the Secretary of Agriculture:

Mr. ANDERSON. Well, Senator, if I may, I would say to you that there have been many times when I have debated with myself very seriously as to whether or not the removal of many of these controls on meat might not be a good thing in view of the surplus population of our ranches.

He means the population of cattle. By the way, there are more than 10,000,000 more cattle on the ranches and on the farms of the United States now than in any other year of the 10 years preceding 1941. So there is a surplus of cattle. The total cattle population is only about 85,000,000. More than one-half of them are beef cattle, and this surplus population is mostly out in the areas of beef cattle. That is what the Secretary means when he says, "I would say to you that there have been many times when I have debated with myself very seriously as to whether or not the removal of many of these controls on meat might not be a good thing in view of the surplus population of our ranches."

He continued:

I would say that about as far as I have been able to persuade myself to go is to regard this present period when we are trying to reestablish slaughter controls as about the last effort to see if it will work. If with slaughter controls and with the increased force that OPA is now putting on this we are not able to direct these cattle back into decent channels, if we are not able to persuade people that they have got to buy in compliance, and if we are not able to get food for the American people at decent prices, then we surely ought to try something else; and the only other "something else" is an abandonment of these controls.

That is the answer of Secretary Anderson.

Mr. President, what about this 5 or 6 weeks of control, this new control order the Secretary put into effect to correct the situation he was discussing when he answered the Senator from Kentucky nearly 5 or 6 weeks ago?

They instituted a program, but the latest program is not stopping the black market.

In fact, after 5 weeks of quotas, more and more cattle are going over the hill in the black market.

As shown by the table I have before me, for the week ending June 1, 1946, 10 national packers who, prior to OPA, handled more than three-fourths of all federally inspected cattle, slaughtered only 29,274, or 26 percent—a smaller percentage than the first week before the control order was made effective about 5 weeks ago.

Remember that these 10 nationally operated packing plants, with all the employment they had, which killed three-fourths of the cattle prior to OPA days, the first week in June slaughtered only 26 percent of the three-fourths kill they slaughtered before the war.

The following is the percentage of slaughter of 10 representative meat

packers located in all parts of the Nation compared to United States federally inspected slaughter:

	1946	1945	1941
Week ending Apr. 27:			
Number of head.....	42,693	116,759	142,013
Percent of total federally inspected slaughter.....	29.4	50.8	76.4
Week ending May 4:			
Number of head.....	58,169	123,152	149,908
Percent of total federally inspected slaughter.....	35.7	52.2	75.0
Week ending May 11:			
Number of head.....	57,697	111,599	161,311
Percent of total federally inspected slaughter.....	35.2	51.0	76.0
Week ending May 18:			
Number of head.....	51,723	115,247	157,335
Percent of total federally inspected slaughter.....	32.5	48.6	72.5
Week ending May 25:			
Number of head.....	44,518	119,860	149,282
Percent of total federally inspected slaughter.....	29.5	49.1	73.2
Week ending June 1:			
Number of head.....	29,274	103,021	139,448
Percent of total federally inspected slaughter.....	26.1	49.8	73.7

So it will be seen that by the end of the first week of June, under the new control program, the cattle killed had fallen to 26.1 percent, which is less than it was at the end of the last week in April, before the control program was put into effect.

That, Mr. President, is concrete evidence—indisputable, unanswerable evidence—that the last program which Mr. Anderson was to try before he removed price controls entirely has failed, and if we are to take his recommendation and advice the only thing for the Senate Banking and Currency Committee to do is to stand by its original amendment, and remove the control of prices from meat, and I think it should also remove the control of prices from milk and dairy products.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Nebraska may be interested to know that the Committee on Banking and Currency this morning on a motion to reconsider the vote by which meat and dairy products were decontrolled voted against the motion to reconsider by a vote of, I think, 10 to 7, which was a somewhat larger majority than the last time the question came up. So the Senator's advice to the committee has already been followed.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Ohio for his statement. I am not a member of the Banking and Currency Committee. My work has been largely upon the Small Business Committee. I think both committees have worked strenuously for many months to attempt at least to have a trial made of removal of control over meat prices. I do not see why we cannot try to decontrol one commodity and see what the result will be. I am glad to know of the favorable action of the Committee on Banking and Currency. That is the first time that committee has given us such favorable action, and I

appreciate the information given the Senate by the Senator from Ohio.

After 5 weeks of the new control order, and increased enforcement activities, practically all cattle are being sold openly at illegal bootleg prices, even on the public markets, and the OPA is wholly impotent to do anything about it. For example, on Tuesday, June 4, approximately 14,000 slaughter cattle were sold on the Chicago market. The average price paid for Choice cattle was \$17.52 per hundred. That is 52 cents per hundred above the maximum price allowed in the Vinson directive, so it is over the ceiling price. On Good to Choice cattle the average price on that market reached \$16.80 per hundred. That is \$1.05 above the maximum ceiling price. For the commercial grades—that is, the B class of cattle—the average price was \$15.48 a hundred, or \$2.48 per hundred above the maximum ceiling price. That, Mr. President, is the meat which most of our people in the low-income brackets have to buy. If we figure it out by percentages we will find whether we are maintaining the ceiling which Mr. Bowles talks about. For Utility cattle—that is, the kind from which canned meats come—the average price was \$13.53 per hundredweight, or \$2.53 above the maximum ceiling price. The average price of all steers of all grades was \$17.02 per hundredweight, or 2 cents per hundredweight above the maximum ceiling price for Choice steers.

It is not strange that legitimate slaughterers are unable to buy enough cattle to keep their plants operating a few hours per week. The bootleggers buy all of the cattle at illegal prices. For example, one of the large national packers, on June 4, notwithstanding that they were ready and willing to buy several thousand head and their buyers were actively bidding at all the following markets—and get this—out of receipts of 14,000 cattle, at Chicago were able to purchase 7; out of 9,500 at Kansas City were able to purchase only 3; out of 12,000 in Omaha were able to purchase only 135; out of 2,400 at Oklahoma City were able to purchase 18; out of 10,000 in Sioux City were able to purchase none; 57 cattle were purchased at Cedar Rapids; 28 cattle at Albert Lea; 156 cattle at Los Angeles; 26 cattle at Sioux Falls; nothing at Fargo; nothing at St. Paul; nothing at Peoria; nothing at Denver. The total buy for that day at all plants, 430 cattle.

This company, in the Chicago market, with 15 active buyers on the market, was able to purchase only 7 head out of 14,000 cattle sold.

These facts are fully known to the Office of Price Administration, the Office of Economic Stabilization, and the Department of Agriculture. It is obvious, if anything is to be done to correct this scandalous condition, the Congress is going to have to do it.

This news should be heralded around the whole country. All this is due to the pricing system. It comes about by reason of the rigid pricing system which has been put into effect in direct contradiction to the testimony of all those who are interested, all those who have the economic welfare of the country at heart.

All this is having a tremendous impact upon our own economy. Think of the tremendous amount of employment in the 15 or 20 plants involved, whose employees are thrown out of work because the plants did not receive cattle for slaughter.

I hope that when the Banking and Currency Committee reports the bill dealing with the extension of OPA, as the committee will with the amendment included in it which has been mentioned by the distinguished Senator from Ohio, the Senate will take the price ceiling off of meat. Such action will permit the free flow of the 10,000,000 surplus beef cattle that are now not being fed because the feeders cannot feed them at the present price ceilings; it will permit them to flow in an orderly fashion through the markets, into the feed lots of the country and back again to the markets, and finally to the consumers' tables. If that is done, it will result in a plentiful supply of meat; the price will be reduced to the level at which it should be, because there will be maximum production. Maximum production is the only way to cure inflation and to decrease prices. Secondly, the meat will come through the legitimate markets, where Federal inspection is had. It will prevent the waste of thousands of head of cattle, the loss of tankage and the various other losses of which I have spoken. Moreover, it will bring about a more wholesome respect for law than exists today because of the widespread extent of black markets. The black market in meat is the most widespread black market in commodities that I know of. The only way to kill the black market is to remove price control from meat and have a free flow of meat through the legitimate markets.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think the Senator from Nebraska has been making a very important contribution in the light of a great pending emergency in this country in respect to the feed situation, particularly as it affects the production of meat. I have just returned from New England, where the people are facing extreme conditions. I have been told that in some instances it has been as long as 9 weeks since stores have had 1 pound of meat for their customers. In New England we have meat lines. Now we also have bread lines. I never expected to live to see the day in America when people would be fighting for meat and for bread. I never expected to live to see the day when people would be fighting with each other, tearing each other's hair in bread lines. It is due to malmanagement, and groups of governmental departments and organizations working exactly at cross purposes with each other, and with no defined policy.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire for his contribution. It emphasizes that not only is this situation true in Nebraska and other Midwestern States, but that the problem is nation-wide. The bread lines and meat lines which he mentioned have also occurred in my section of the country, where we produce meat. The results are national in scope.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Last week I was in North Dakota, in the middle of the Red River Valley. As the Senator from Nebraska knows, that section is known as the bread basket of the world. We could not obtain flour or meat. I was in the town of St. Thomas, where the American Legion was having a dinner. It could not obtain bread. That is the situation in that section of the Nation.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator from North Dakota for his contribution. It shows the widespread results of the price-fixing program.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I point out to the Senator that the situation is growing so serious that people are becoming angry and desperate as they face a vital need for meat, fat products, butter, or butter substitutes in their diets. I am also informed that for the first time druggists are now facing the impossibility of procuring needed medicines, because of the lack of cattle going through the big slaughtering plants for legitimate slaughter. Many persons who are suffering from diabetes or other major diseases today cannot obtain medicines to keep themselves alive. This is the result of the black market in meat.

Mr. WHERRY. The statement made by the distinguished Senator corroborates what I said earlier in my remarks. Operators of bootleg, mushroom, non-federally inspected packing plants which have grown up wish to hide their black-market operations. They do not even apply for the subsidy. No attempt is made to market the offal. In fact, they must hide it or they may be caught. The remarks of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire corroborate what I say, that in addition to the loss in price, there is a loss because of the waste of the offal, containing the glands from which the medicines referred to by the distinguished Senator must come. The shortage is becoming acute.

I have received a message from South Carolina informing me that there is likely to be a wholesale break-down of law. The people are determined to have meat, and will slaughter their own cattle if necessary. When the situation reaches such a point, it is time for the Congress of the United States to assert itself. I only hope that when the OPA bill comes before us the membership of the Senate will have enough courage to take the initiative and direct the agencies downtown to get together on a program which will provide meat at prices which the people can afford to pay, and under conditions which will permit us to obtain full value from the offal from the animals which are slaughtered in our great markets.

Mr. BRIDGES. Leadership must come from somewhere. Today all the leadership in the executive departments in Washington is a bewildered, double-dealing, confused leadership which is failing to produce any really construc-

tive program which will provide either bread for every-day use, or meat, butter, or butter substitutes, which are so badly needed by our people. When other leadership falls down completely, Congress is forced to assume leadership.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. I thank the distinguished Senator, and I know that he would like to have me thank the distinguished Senator from North Dakota for his contribution.

The Senator from New Hampshire has referred to the confused leadership. In my judgment that expression defines the present situation in which we find ourselves. The distinguished Senator from New Hampshire has been a Member of the Senate for many years, and has provided real leadership on this side of the aisle. I wish to say to him that when the OPA bill comes before us it will be time for Congress to assert its leadership. I shall be glad to work alongside the distinguished Senator in an effort to obtain constructive relief.

EXTENSION OF SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1940

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 2057) to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, until May 15, 1947, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMBE] for himself and other Senators, in the nature of a substitute for Senate bill 2057.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I now turn to the pending question.

As a cosponsor of the pending amendment, along with the Senator from West Virginia, I wish to compliment the Senator not only for the provision which has been drafted, but for his position.

Briefly, there is very little difference between the pending amendment and the committee bill, with the exception of the proposal to suspend the inductions.

I am in favor of having an Army of a size necessary to meet our needs. I wish the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] to know that. I have served with him on the Committee on Appropriations, and have followed his guidance. He has done a remarkable job. His judgment and ability are respected on both sides of the aisle. I dislike to disagree with the able leadership of the Senator from South Dakota; but I have a deep feeling about drafting an Army, especially in peacetime. I believe that the way to obtain an Army is through the voluntary system. I have always had that conviction.

I was impressed by the answer given by certain Senators today relative to the scale of pay which we have provided for members of the volunteer Army. They feel that after a while wages will increase, and the pay which we are proposing for those who go into the Army will not be sufficient. That is further justification for the argument that we should not induct men into the Army if they cannot live in the Army at the pay which they receive. We should increase the pay in the Army to such a level that those in the Army can live upon it.

It seems to me to be a sad commentary on our present system when those who now advocate induction say that that is the best way to raise an Army, because it would cost less than if the Army were raised on a volunteer basis. The argument is that in the future, if wages increase, the present rates of pay in the Army will not be sufficient, and therefore the only way we can assure ourselves of an Army is through the draft. It seems to me that that is a sad commentary upon the way we are discharging the debt which we owe to those who died for their country, and who volunteered for the service in order to make it a career.

Last night I was at a nearby fort. I wished to talk with some of the boys who reenlisted in the Army. I talked with a top sergeant who told me that he knew of 14 men who had been mustered out of the Army who would be only too glad to reenlist if the bill providing increased pay for volunteers were enacted. That is the best kind of evidence, because it reflects the sentiments of the boys who would like to reenlist in the Army.

Mr. President, I feel that the arguments presented by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia are unanswerable. The substitute amendment gives the Army what it asks in numbers. I wish to go along with the Army in whatever estimates it makes as to its needs.

The figures given by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia clearly show that even without provision for increased pay we are ahead of schedule so far as volunteers are concerned. I believe that no one will dispute the statement that a volunteer Army of 1,500,000 would be preferable to a conscript Army of the same size. I endorse that statement without reservation.

When the pay schedule in the so-called Johnson-La Follette amendment goes into effect, those now in the service will receive increased pay, and many boys who could not afford to go into the Army, and who, as the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] pointed out, accept unemployment pay rather than go into the Army, will go back into the Army. I believe that there will be no difficulty in raising an Army of sufficient size. There will be a sufficient number of volunteers to constitute an Army of 1,500,000, and we can bring back all the boys who have been inducted and who have served 18 months overseas.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Corroborating what the distinguished Senator has said, I invite attention to the testimony of Philip La Follette, former Governor of Wisconsin, who served under General MacArthur. He testified before the committee that the pay should be at least \$100 a month for a private.

I also invite attention to the statement of former Senator Bennett Champ Clark, the first commander of the American Legion. He agreed that the pay should be at least \$100 a month. In my judgment, the Johnson-La Follette amendment still leaves the pay too low.

I certainly am much pleased to see the distinguished Senator from Nebraska back up this amendment so vigorously.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

Inasmuch as the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is also very vitally interested in this measure, I should like to say to him that if the Senate had adopted the provision he introduced nearly a year ago for an increase in pay, we probably would not find ourselves now in the situation we are in. I am satisfied that if we had taken that action, we would now find the volunteers coming into the service in numbers far ahead of the schedule. It is regrettable that some of us whose opinions were different from those of the Senator from Oregon did not support that proposal for an increase in pay. I am convinced that we need a volunteer Army, and that the way to get it is to make service in the armed forces sufficiently attractive.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate the Senator's kind words. I wish to say that I feel we are going a long way toward setting up a volunteer Army. I regret that I cannot find myself in complete agreement with the Senator from Nebraska on the question of how best to secure a volunteer Army, but I am in agreement with him that we should put the Army on a voluntary basis as soon as possible.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has pointed out that the people of America need to be told the truth concerning the reasons why the extension of the Selective Service System is now being demanded by the administration. He made a powerful statement. To my knowledge I think it is the first time that such a concrete and forceful statement has been made relative to the proposal to extend the draft.

The reasons why the administration now is demanding that the draft system be extended are perfectly obvious. Something terrible has happened to the highly touted wartime unity of the Big Three upon which was based every promise and every hope of peace in the postwar world. Let us remember that the Axis nations have been completely destroyed and that, in spite of all the propaganda to the contrary, the neutral nations are unable to threaten another world war.

For instance, on May 22, 1946, our own State Department finally admitted that—

The Spanish economy in itself is totally inadequate for waging war, either offensively or defensively, against a major power.

Among the remaining non-English-speaking nations we find that their cities are devastated. I saw that at first hand. We find that their people are physically exhausted. I saw that at first hand. We find that their economies are bankrupt, I think, with one exception, and that one exception is Russia.

Mr. President, let us be perfectly frank. Russia is the major reason why the present administration, I think, is demanding an extension of the selective-service law. I can draw no other conclusion from the public utterances of the most outspoken supporters of the administration's foreign policy and the

strongest friends of Russia in America. Where once there was the optimistic hope of understanding and cooperation between Russia and the western democracies, there is now only disillusionment bordering on despair.

Maj. George Fielding Eliot now admits that—

While we thought the war was going to bring us peace and hope, it has brought us only fear and suffering.

Mr. Harold Stassen, a world-order enthusiast, now warns us that relations among the Big Three have become so strained that we must never permit the veto power to be used by Russia "to excuse an act of aggression" or to excuse the other members of the Security Council "from enforcing the solemn obligations of the Charter." I have quoted his own words.

Mr. Averell Harriman, recently retired Ambassador to the Soviet Union, now admits his disappointment and concern over Russia's flagrant violations of her pledged word.

Secretary Henry Wallace, another world-order enthusiast, recently told the American Society for Russian Relief that Russia cannot ride roughshod over eastern Europe and get away with it.

On May 10, 1946, the Washington Post, one of our great internationalist newspapers, and up until very recently one of the strongest defenders of Russia's aggression, finally admitted in an editorial that:

We are faced today with a condition, not a theory. The condition is not that Britain and Russia are preparing for war, but that Russia will not make peace. What our angel of peace is afraid of is, bluntly, Russian aggression. Only Russia has the might and the posture (her armies in Europe are all poised for battle) to break the peace.

These men, many of whom supported the political, secret commitments throughout the war at Moscow, Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam, and who sold the American people the philosophy of enforcing—at any price—the peace on which the United Nation's Organization is based—and I voted for it—are now confronted with the staggering prospect of enforcing the peace, against Russia. This means that the fear of Russia is the primary reason for the extension of selective service now being demanded by the present administration.

More than one Senator has said on the floor of the Senate, "We want this for insurance." It is to be insurance against what, Mr. President? Certainly the Army that General Eisenhower is asking for will number only 1,500,000 men, and we are going to get it the volunteer way if the volunteer system is given a chance.

A second reason for the demand for extension of selective service lies in the nature of the war-breeding secret commitments this administration seeks to enforce. These political commitments have torn the world in two, and have left Russia in control of conquests that outrank the greatest conquests in history. I saw it with my own eyes. The old balance of power is gone. Any hope of restoring or reviving it, on the basis of our present policies, is sheer illusion. We have left Russia, as I have

said on so many other occasions, in control of the heart lands of the economic resources of both Europe and Asia, but with a minimum of their populations. On the other hand, the United States has been left with the permanent deficit economies of what is left of the rest of the world, outside of the Russian sphere.

By the atrocious Morgenthau plan for Germany, we have set in motion the forces of our own destruction. Our highest-ranking military men, both in Britain and the United States, are now aghast at the terrifying prospect which the Morgenthau plan has drawn up for the future in Europe. I saw it, and I wish to say that I commend and endorse what some of the high-ranking military men have said about a continuance of the Morgenthau plan in Europe.

At this very moment we are parties to mass deportations, mass starvation, and a suicidal destruction of the facilities for mass production of even peacetime goods, without which not only Germany and Austria but the whole of Europe are doomed to a future of unmeasurable suffering and degradation.

Mr. President, I just came from the food conference that is being held by the Small Business Committee, and I wish to state that we are going to be called upon to scrape the bottom of the barrel, not only this year and next year, but for years to come, if the Morgenthau plan is continued in operation upon the 100,000,000 people of Central Europe upon whom it is now being pressed. There is simply no chance for them to make a living or to sustain themselves under such a system.

Mr. Walter Lippmann has now admitted, upon his recent return from Germany, that:

No one, least of all the Russians themselves, believes that the political frontier between them and the British can be stabilized where it now is.

This is the reason why every statesman in Europe has it in the back of his mind as his ultimate controlling assumption that he must act as if there were going to be a war between Britain and Russia, which will involve all the other nations.

On May 21, Gen. Joseph T. McNarney, American military governor of the American zone in Germany, according to the New York Herald Tribune—

Painted the gloomiest picture of Germany's future since the occupation began a year ago * * * The gravest note struck at his press conference was the admission that instead of economically united Germany, as called for at Potsdam. The country may solidify permanently into separate zones.

On May 31, 1946, General Marshall delivered a grim Memorial Day speech in Nanking, China.

The speech he made on that occasion has been described as follows:

His mission to halt the development of one of the most tragic situations in history and terminate civil strife among a people who already endured 8 years of war, is being retarded by suspicion, hate, and bitterness. The general went on to warn that China was "trembling on the verge of an even greater calamity than World War II."

On May 22, 1946, Mr. Sumner Welles, after having warned the American peo-

ple that a catastrophe is in the making, continued as follows:

From Cairo to Tokyo, the eastern world is seething. All constituted authority, whether alien or national, has been gravely weakened during the past 7 years. The economic dislocations resulting from the war, culminating with the present famine, intensify the trend toward mass unrest, toward revolt, and toward eventual anarchy.

There is no question that these brutal secret agreements do not constitute the second reason for this administration demanding the extension of selective service.

The third reason for the extension of the selective service has already been admitted by the President. He intends to use the extension of selective service as a spearhead of a movement to saddle upon the American people universal peacetime conscription for the first time in our history.

I should like to answer those who say that the pending bill is not an assurance of universal conscription in the United States. That is what the extension of the draft act really means.

Mr. President, I am convinced that America now stands at the cross roads of the future. Down one road lies the inevitability of an atomic war. Down the second road lies the chance that such a war may be averted through an all-out peace offensive.

I am further convinced that the extension of selective service and the continuation of a conscript Army by the United States will lead us down the first road to an atomic war. If we put this requested power in the hands of those who have handled such power already, and they carry out our present war-breeding commitments, it will take us down the road to an atomic war.

The continuation of selective service, and, eventually, of universal military conscription, will continue to force the Army to serve as the whipping boy of the policy makers within this administration who, up to this point, have been unwilling or unable to use any other method than force for the restoration of peace.

Mr. President, the Army does not establish our foreign policy. I heard General Eisenhower, for whom I have the greatest respect, testify that the Army is told what lands must be occupied, what the policies are, and then the Army is fitted into the pattern. Our foreign policy is made in the State Department. When an order is given to occupy certain territories the head of the Army knows the number and kind of Army personnel which will be required to occupy the territories, and upon that basis he estimates the military requirements. At this moment the Army is being used as a whipping boy for policy-making circles in this Government.

Is it not significant that the policy makers of this administration have not yet made any attempt formally to end this war, or to repudiate the war-breeding commitments which are breeding even greater confusion, conflict, and suffering with every hour that passes, or to champion the return to sane, peacetime processes such as the universal abolition of conscription, and progressive multi-

lateral disarmament? The policy makers have not yet begun to direct our resources into the staggering task of rebuilding a shattered world on the basis of peacetime reconstruction. Instead, Mr. President, this administration is exerting such pressure on the War Department as to cause a complete state of confusion in Congress and in the minds of the American people, even concerning the necessity of the extension of selective service in order to meet our military requirements of 1,500,000 men by July 1, 1946, and 1,070,000 men by July 1, 1947.

For example, the Army, in attempting to carry out this administration policy, has stated that the voluntary enlistments are caused entirely, or almost entirely, by the draft. On March 28 General Hershey told the Senate Military Affairs Committee:

Inasmuch as the enlistments from civilian life are almost entirely made either from persons who are liable or who are about to become liable for military service under the provisions of the Selective Service Act, I am of the opinion that termination of the act will seriously affect the recruiting program.

That, Mr. President, is the kind of propaganda that has been spread. But, according to the New York Times of March 14, 1946, Maj. Gen. Edward F. Witsell, Adjutant General of the United States Army, reveals that:

Analysis of the figures shows that most of the men are veterans. Of those enlisted, 67.07 percent served in the Army of the United States during the war; 14.23 percent had served in the Regular Army before the war; and 18.7 percent are young men, mostly 17- and 18-year-olds. (New York Times, March 14, 1946.)

In other words, not more than about 18 percent are enlisting to avoid the draft. And if the Army's statement is correct, how does the Army explain away the fact that about 53 percent of all those who enlist volunteer for a 3-year period? If they were enlisting to escape the draft or to limit their period of service, they would have volunteered either for a 1-year or 18-month term. I invite the attention of the Members of the Senate to that fact. Of all those who enlist, 53 percent do not enlist for 18 months or a shorter period; they enlist for 3 years. If we give an increase in pay to those men we will not have trouble in developing a volunteer Army for the United States.

A second example of this kind of contradiction is contained in the following analysis of the War Department's claims concerning the rate of volunteer enlistments. The War Department has stated that its volunteer rate is declining and that it therefore needs a draft. Secretary of War Patterson, in the Senate Military Affairs Committee hearings (p. 130), spoke of the declining recruiting figures. In the House hearings Secretary Patterson, on March 21, said:

According to our best estimates we should get an average of 30,000 volunteer enlistments per month for the last 6 months of 1946 and 20,000 volunteer enlistments per month for 1947 if the Selective Service Act is not continued.

But a member of the Military Affairs Committee of the House, Representative

CHARLES CLASON, on April 13 told the House of Representatives:

As for the number that enlisted in March, there were 73,499, and there has not been any lessening in the number of persons who were trying to enlist. In other words, just as many are going to the recruiting stations, but the Army has raised the standards from 59 to 70. I am told that before the Army raised the standards only one out of seven persons was rejected; now three out of seven persons are rejected. That accounts for the apparent falling off in enlistments.

And when the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], in the Senate hearings—page 257—asked whether the higher test was applied to draftees as well as volunteers, General Paul stated that it had not been applied to drafted men. In other words, the same tests had not been applied to drafted men which were applied to those who wished to enlist in the Army. General Paul did not add that during April the selective service standards had been lowered in order to take men previously deferred as IV-F.

Moreover, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], in commenting on the declining volunteer rate, said to Generals Eisenhower and Paul—page 259 of Senate hearings:

Comparative statistics are no good if you change any of the rules in regard to the statistics. * * * If, for instance, the number is changed something like 10 percent, then it is improper to come and say there is a falling off. We know that 10 percent falling off has come about as a result of your own action.

Furthermore, as of April 30, 1946, the volunteer enlistments totaled 736,590. With 1 month yet to go, the enlistments are ahead of schedule, since the War Department expected only 800,000 by July 1, 1946. If pay increases such as have already passed the House are granted to soldiers, an even higher volunteer rate is expected.

That is the guaranty, the best guaranty there is, that we will have an Army of volunteers who want to make a career, who will make the kind of an Army the military can use to the best advantage, in place of a group of inductees, many of whom are inducted as young teen-agers, who, in my opinion, should continue at school, and if they want to make the Army a career, they should go into it as volunteers, which is the traditional American way.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I wish to compliment the Senator on making one of the greatest speeches I have heard on the Senate floor during the 5½ years I have been a Member of the Senate.

Let me say to the Senator that there is no drafting in Mexico, there is no drafting in any country of South America, there is no drafting anywhere on earth so far as I can ascertain, except in England and the United States, and possibly in Russia. There is not even drafting in Canada. I certainly compliment the Senator for bringing so forcefully to the attention of the American people that we are departing from the American way of life if we pass the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator from North Dakota. I very much appreciate his remarks.

In the second place, the extension of all the wartime powers implicit in the Selective Service Act seems destined to be used as a substitute for real peace principles and actions, without which war is rapidly becoming inevitable.

As an excuse for a failure to change our present suicidal policy, the extension of these war powers into every administrative office through every area of our economy, and into every home in the land, will continue the blundering evasion of the real issues we confront, and bring to a head the conflict now brewing through a sheer refusal to take a stand one way or the other.

It will affect our country. All these commitments will affect us. If it is the draft, it means taking the boys of America. If it is a commitment to the British loan, it means that we are going to make a political gift to England, and political loans to other countries, which will mean an impact upon our economy, because the taxpayers will have to pay the loan. It is not an economic loan, it is a gift, and it will have a tremendous effect on our economy.

Take any of these commitments. Take the commitment as to food we are making today. It is significant to recall that as we make these commitments, and scrape the bottom of the barrel, it is having a tremendous effect on the economy of the United States.

One has only to recall how during the war the demand was insistently made that this power and control over life and death of the American people extended to a demand for compulsory labor bills, for the extension of the draft to include nurses, and women, and all the able-bodied men in this country. I am not willing to give these forces a new lease of life in America in time of peace.

I shall oppose the committee's proposal, but shall support, as a cosponsor, to the very best of my ability, the Revercomb amendment, which I think provides the solution to the present military needs, which I am perfectly willing to supply through the volunteer system.

Furthermore, on the basis of our present international policy, the extension of these war powers in the hands of this administration would be the last step necessary to set in motion the forces which would destroy our way of life from within.

We have already surrendered congressional power to declare war. We now have nothing to say about declaring war. We have given authority in advance to the President.

We have also surrendered the greater part of our treaty-making power. I suggest to Senators that they read the minority report by the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], which he has already filed, having to do with the St. Lawrence waterway. Read that report, because to a great extent it shows that we have surrendered the treaty-making powers of the Congress, and now are depending upon executive agreements to control the economy and the lives of the American

people. I am not willing to extend, especially in peacetime, powers which affect the very freedom of our American life, which I came to the Senate to support and to defend.

We have already surrendered the power of Congress to negotiate reciprocal trade agreements.

We are already heading into an era of governmental international pump-priming finance.

We are over our heads in food commitments, which can never be met, unless we follow Under Secretary Acheson's advice to go take our food supplies at their source. We have already taken 25 percent of the 1946 wheat crop under that theory of "go take."

I am unwilling to sanction an extension of the present war powers implicit in the Selective Service Act which would permit the savage external commitments we have already made to transform our American way of life into a totalitarian society from within. I am not ready to go that far.

Certainly the advocates of the extension of selective service cannot defend the thesis that an Army of 1,070,000 men by July 1, 1947, will back up American diplomats or American foreign policy insofar as Russia is concerned. History already reveals that when our military strength was greatest American statesmen agreed to some of the greatest political betrayals in history.

Even for the purposes of occupation of ex-enemy countries or for policing the world the peacetime draftees which would be made available to the American Army through the extension of selective service are admittedly a greater liability than asset.

On May 5, 1946, even Brig. Gen. Julius Ocha Adler, vice president and general manager of the New York Times, wrote for the Times over his signature:

Another fairly obvious mistake was apparent in shipping to the United States zones of occupation the newest, rawest, and youngest soldiers taken in the latter draft.

"They are comparative babies," General Adler said. "The few remaining combat veterans who are still in the occupied areas—the soldiers whose ages range from, say 24 to 26 or 27 years, stated this quite bluntly. They pointed out that the new drafts from the United States were too young to make a good impression on our enemies. Natives display, more or less openly, their contempt for the teen-agers who have replaced the combat-hardened men."

I do not want the position I have taken in any way interpreted as meaning that I do not recognize the seriousness of the crisis before us, or that I am maintaining we do not need an army to deal with that crisis. I do recognize it, and I have tried to point out in clear terms what the issue in this country is. I believe we do need an army, that we need to remain strong to defend ourselves and our vital interests. I shall be glad on the floor of the Senate to support such an army, and I shall support it in the Committee on Appropriations, where the support really counts. I am in favor of giving the military any sized army it needs to do the job it has to do. But I am taking the position that, for this purpose, a volunteer army is going to be far more effective,

and infinitely to be preferred, over an army of conscripted men.

Maj. Gen. J. F. C. Fuller, one of England's outstanding military experts, now tells us that the time has come when "nations may now wage a war of maximum annihilation against each other without moving a man or a machine."

As another British military analyst, Capt. B. H. Liddell Hart, has said concerning the need to abolish the principle of conscription in the future military establishments of the world:

Why don't we learn from history?

Twenty-five years spent in the study of war, a study which gradually went beyond its current technique to its well-springs, changed my earlier and conventional belief in the value of conscription. It brought me to see that the compulsory principle was fundamentally inefficient, and the conscriptive method out of date—a method that clung, like the ivy, to quantitative standards in an age when the trend of warfare was becoming increasingly qualitative. For it sustained the fetish of mere numbers at a time when skill and enthusiasm were becoming ever more necessary for the effective handling of the new weapons.

Conscription does not fit the conditions of modern warfare—its specialized technical equipment, mobile operations, and fluid situations. Success increasingly depends on individual initiative, which in turn springs from a sense of personal responsibility—these senses are atrophied by compulsion. Moreover, every unwilling man is a germ carrier, spreading infection to an extent altogether disproportionate to the value of the service he is forced to contribute.

One of our own recently retired military men, Brig. Gen. H. C. Holdridge has recently stated that:

The rigidity of the Army thinking on the problem of national security is as dangerous as the Maginot Line complex was to France. If we adopt its policy of basing national security on mass armies, we will pay stupendous sums to maintain obsolete forces, and will be purchasing a delusion of national security instead of real security.

These references present another reason why we should be apprehensive about the draft. We should not use obsolete methods in our preparation for military security. Perhaps we should give greater attention to research. I voted for the research bill, I voted for the atomic energy bill. I believe we should pursue vigorously a progressive military system to defend this country, and to guard the peace.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I was called from the floor and was unable to hear all the able Senator's address. But the point has been made in the discussion that unless inductions are continued, an Army of volunteers cannot be raised. Has the Senator dwelt upon the fact that 53 percent of the 770,000 men who have already enlisted have enlisted for 3 years?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. And also that a large proportion of them have enlisted for 1 year?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. It is certain that men who enlist for 3 years do not enlist because of the draft. Is not that so?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. And certainly those who enlist for 1 year, being already in the Army and not affected by the draft, would not enlist because of the draft.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator's remarks pose a question which is an imponderable factor to me in this situation. He has said that he is willing that the Army and Navy be given the maximum force they say they require for national security.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Suppose it is not obtained by voluntary methods. What would the Senator do?

Mr. WHERRY. It is obtainable by voluntary methods, as was demonstrated by the invincible argument presented by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. We have raised, or will raise, 1,500,000. That has been done without any increase in pay. I am of the opinion that we can continue to raise an army by means of volunteers, and when a crisis comes men will volunteer to defend the country.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is not the question.

Mr. WHERRY. The question the Senator is asking me is what we would do if we do not raise the number of men needed by the voluntary system. I have been contending for 20 minutes that the assurance of a sufficiently large army lies in proper pay for the men who enlist in the Army. The figures which the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has already submitted indicate that we are to have 1,500,000 men in the Army by July 1, 1946, if we do not already have them, which General Eisenhower stated is the required number. If we need more we will obtain them through increase of pay.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If I may go back to my question—

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I hope the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Nebraska are totally correct. I infinitely prefer a volunteer army. I think it is the only kind of army in peacetime which comports with the American tradition. I agree with the Senator from Nebraska that we must provide what the Army and the Navy specify as being essential. I again ask: What happens if the Senator from Nebraska and if the Senator from West Virginia are wrong and the volunteer system does not produce it?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The figures were given to the Senate, and I regret that the able Senator from Michigan was not present earlier today when they were given. I took the figures from the testimony of General Eisenhower when he appeared before the Committee on Mil-

tary Affairs, in the hearings held on January 16, 17, and 18, 1946. The first figure, I would point out to the Senator from Michigan, has to do with the overseas employment of the Army. The Chief of Staff wants for July 1, 1946, for overseas service to meet all the requirements, all the needs abroad, 794,000 men. That, as I see it, embraces both officers and men. On July 1, 1946—and this is the Army's own estimate and figure—there will be 800,000 volunteer enlisted men and 150,000 officers, a total of 950,000. In other words, every position abroad, every call by the Army—and the Army never underestimates—can be filled with volunteers.

In addition to that it is desired that seven-hundred-some-odd-thousand men be in this country. Therefore, I have said, I remind the able Senator from Michigan, that by July 1, if we would send the volunteers abroad, every place abroad could be filled with the volunteers, and every man who is abroad under drafted service could be returned to this country for service here.

But let us go to another figure. According to the Army's own figures there will be 950,000 officers and men and volunteers in the service on July 1, 1946. That figure includes 800,000 enlisted men and 150,000 officers. I may say to the able Senator from Michigan that that figure with respect to enlisted men is in my opinion low, in view of the rate at which recruits are being enlisted today, and with respect to officers, we are advised on the floor that the figure today is closer to 250,000 than it is to 150,000.

In addition to the 950,000, taking the Army's own figure, there will be 50,000 Philippine Scouts. That is the Army's figure. There is no reason why it cannot have more, but that is the Army's figure. So that represents a total of 1,000,000 men.

There have been inducted into the armed services since the 1st of January 1945, 927,874 men who, if still in the service would have been in the service 18 months. If we may take half of that figure in order to take care of casualties and reenlistments—and I think that is certainly a very broad concession—we would have in the service today 456,598 men who have not served over 18 months. That makes a grand total of 1,456,598, which I say would be the minimum on July 1, with not more than 18 months of service, and volunteers.

The Army is asking for only 1,550,000. There is a small difference there—in fact, I would say there is no difference—but, even taking that figure, why extend the induction for a year when we are obtaining volunteers at the rate even of the last figure we have of more than 40,000 a month? I may say, further, that we are reducing the Army from July 1 on, and not increasing its numbers, at the request of the War Department.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator from West Virginia for his encouraging arithmetic, but I come back to my question. As I understand this bill, there

will not be a man drafted if the volunteers fill the quotas. Is that not correct?

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, if the volunteers do not fill the quota, in spite of the arithmetic of the Senator from West Virginia, I ask the Senator from Nebraska, since he agrees with me that the Army must have its quota, where does the Army get the men?

Mr. WHERRY. My answer is that we can get them by recruiting under a volunteer system.

Mr. VANDENBERG. But suppose that system does not produce them?

Mr. WHERRY. I am not going to suppose that because we have not given volunteer recruiting a fair chance.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I want to give it a fair chance.

Mr. WHERRY. Then why does the military raise the points for reenlistment from 59 to 70 and at the same time reduce the points for the drafted men so low that it even takes in IV-F's?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I would not have the remotest idea why the military does that. I would not support this bill until it textually asserted that there would be no drafting except when there is a failure of the volunteer system.

Mr. WHERRY. Let us turn it around, Mr. President. Would the Senator support the bill on the theory that we can obtain enough volunteers, but if the national security requires the drafting of men, put the draft again into operation? What is the difference?

Mr. VANDENBERG. The difference is that we would then have to wait for legislation to catch up with the deficit.

Mr. WHERRY. If there is a national emergency we will not have to wait 3 minutes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If there is a national emergency why not anticipate it?

Mr. WHERRY. If there is a national emergency more than 1,500,000 men will be needed. Reversing the figures, I will say that I think that is a proper way to proceed. The Senator is not willing to give the recruiting of volunteers for the Army a chance.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Who does the Senator mean? The Senator is not talking about the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. WHERRY. I think I am, if I understand the Senator's remarks correctly. The Senator wants to proceed and put the draft into effect.

Mr. VANDENBERG. When?

Mr. WHERRY. Immediately.

Mr. VANDENBERG. When the volunteer system fails to produce the troops that the Senator from Nebraska says he is willing for the Army to have.

Mr. WHERRY. And that is immediately.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does the Senator mean the volunteer system has already broken down?

Mr. WHERRY. No; the draft system would proceed immediately under the Senator's theory.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Only if the volunteer system fails.

Mr. WHERRY. And the volunteer system will only fail if we cannot get enough men through volunteering. Why not obtain a volunteer Army?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I do not know.

Mr. WHERRY. Why not give the Army a chance to recruit volunteers under this bill, and then if an emergency arises and we need more men we can immediately, under the national emergency, induct all the men we want into the Army. I will say to the Senator that if an emergency arises we will not have to have selective service. Millions of men will want to volunteer. The difference is that the volunteer system is the traditional American system, and the induction system, as the Senator from Michigan may have heard me say previously, departs from the American way. I think it leads to ultimate conscription in this country, and I am opposed to it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; I will be glad to yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to come back to my question.

Mr. WHERRY. I have not answered it, apparently.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I agree with everything the Senator with such vehement eloquence says about the volunteer system. I want the volunteer system to be our exclusive reliance so long as it produces the net result. The Senator and I agree, as I understand—

Mr. WHERRY. I think so.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That the Army must have whatever the minimum essential figure is.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. My statement is that I want no draft made of a single man unless there is a deficit as a result of the volunteering system. That certainly is not deserting the volunteer system. I have voted for maximum pay increases in order to make volunteering as attractive as possible. I want to give the volunteer system a maximum chance. But I am unable to follow the Senator as to what his answer is to my question if, after all these inducements have been put to work, if in those circumstances, despite the expectations of the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from West Virginia, there is still a deficit. I do not see how the deficit can be filled except by a final supplemental draft from month to month to fill the quota.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Since the able Senator from Michigan has involved the Senator from West Virginia in his inquiry I should like to—

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am sorry; the Senator from West Virginia involved himself in the inquiry of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I involved myself quite at length a while ago; but in the last question I think there was reference to the Senator from West Virginia, and I appreciate the opportunity to answer. As I see it, the answer to the able Senator's question is that, first, the facts, as I tried to place them before the Senate today, assure us that there will be a volunteer Army. The Senator asks the question, Suppose there is not? If the amendment fails to work, the Congress

can immediately start inductions again. All the machinery is established, and the personnel will be maintained.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REVERCOMB. In a moment.

It comes down to this: Shall we leave it up to the Army to decide whether or not it wishes to continue inductions in its own way, or shall Congress decide the policy as to who shall be inducted? Let me point out to the able Senator—and I say it with all respect—that the Army wants selective service. The Army likes to select the men. The Army wants to go through the country and pick out the very best men. I do not blame the Army leaders. They want the highest class Army. They are proud of their corps, and naturally so. But is the Congress to leave in their hands the making of the rules as to who shall be inducted?

I have doubted very much that the Army has gone all-out to get volunteers. I doubt it particularly in the light of the order issued on March 8, 1946. Previous to that time, men had been taken into the Army on the basis of a passing grade of 59—not only men for a peacetime army, since the fall of Japan, but the men who fought the war, and the men who constituted the Army before we got into the war. Suddenly, on March 8, the passing grade was raised from 59 to 70. That prevented many volunteers from coming in, because they fell below the passing grade. I have been assured of that in one instance by a sergeant who is engaged in the work of obtaining volunteers.

In the light of those facts, are we, who make the policies, going to establish policies which will make possible the raising of a volunteer army, or shall we leave it in the hands of those who would rather select the highest grades and make their own policies, and naturally cut down the number of volunteers for the Army? That is the whole question. Which is the wiser course?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to conclude my remarks, but I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask my distinguished and able colleague from West Virginia if it is not true that under the terms of his amendment a joint resolution by Congress would be required to put the selective-service features back into operation?

Mr. REVERCOMB. That is true. It would require either a joint resolution or a bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In the relatively short time I have been a Member of the Senate it has been my observation that legislation does not pass immediately, as suggested by my able colleagues from West Virginia and Nebraska. How is the Senator to guard against a situation in which a filibuster might be conducted against the passage of a joint resolution to put the selective service back into operation?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I can no more think of a filibuster being conducted against a proposal to increase the size

of the Army for a national emergency than I can think of a filibuster in time of a declaration of war. This Congress acted in a matter of hours on the question of a declaration of war.

Mr. HAWKES. A matter of minutes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am told that it acted in a matter of minutes. I cannot conceive of any such delay. So far as I know, in such crises there has been no delay, and none can be supposed.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, continuing my remarks, I wish to say in further answer to the distinguished Senator from Michigan that it is my humble opinion, for whatever it may be worth, that so long as men can be inducted, recruiting of volunteers will be at a disadvantage. In my judgment, with the increased pay, the Army will have no difficulty in recruiting its forces up to a size of 1,500,000. If suppositions are to be indulged in, if we should be unable to obtain them through the volunteer system—and I think we shall—if an emergency should arise there would be no difficulty about putting the selective-service machinery back into operation, so as to obtain all the men necessary for any emergency. I am making a plea not to place extensive powers in the hands of those who favor induction. If the selective service is continued, we may continue to make commitments to enforce peace throughout the world which we otherwise might not make if we depended upon a volunteer Army.

I hope that when this amendment reaches a final vote it will be interpreted in that light. It is my opinion that in granting this power we are departing from our traditional American way of life. We are placing in the hands of individuals a new power which they will use if they know that inductions can be continued. I risk the prediction that not only will the power be exercised to draft men to make an army of 1,500,000 this year; but next year and the year following there will be a demand for extension of the selective service. So I say the time has come, if we are in an era of peace, to go to a voluntary system.

As to the number of men required, I believe that we should leave it to the judgment of the military to decide what numbers are needed to carry out certain commitments and certain recommendations from the State Department. I am perfectly willing to go along to that extent.

But I wish to tell the distinguished Senator from Michigan and other Senators that I feel that extending the draft is an entirely different procedure. It is different from anything we have ever done before. I think it would be the spearhead for conscription and for added power which might be used. The system of a volunteer army is a system which we have had traditionally in this country since its birth.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The Senator has expressed—and I think very wisely so—some apprehension as to the implications involved in this proposal. I wonder if

the able Senator has before him a bill, S. 1847, which is now on the calendar of the Senate, and which reads as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of May 19, 1926 (44 Stat. pt. 2, p. 565), as amended by the act of May 14, 1935 (49 Stat. 218), be, and hereby is, amended to read as follows:

"DETAIL OF OFFICERS AND MEN TO ASSIST FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS

"The President of the United States is authorized, upon application from foreign governments, and whenever in his discretion the public interest renders such a course advisable, to detail officers and enlisted men of the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, to assist such foreign governments: *Provided*, That the officers and enlisted men so detailed are authorized to accept from the government to which detailed offices and such compensation and emoluments thereunto appertaining as may be first approved by the Secretary of War, or by the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be: *Provided further*, That such compensation may be accepted by the United States Government for remittance to the individual if in the opinion of the Secretary of War, or of the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, such a course appears desirable: *Provided further*, That while so detailed such officers and enlisted men shall receive in addition to the compensation and emoluments allowed them by such governments, the pay and allowances where-to entitled in the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and shall be allowed the same credit for longevity, retirement, and for all other purposes that they would receive if they were serving with the forces of the United States: *And provided further*, That in addition to or in the absence of such compensation from such governments, the officers and enlisted men so detailed shall receive such additional compensation as may be determined by the Secretary of War, or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, and approved by the President."

The present law reads as follows:

540. Detail of officers and men to assist foreign governments: The President of the United States is authorized, upon application from the foreign governments concerned, and whenever in his discretion the public interests render such a course advisable, to detail officers and enlisted men of the United States Army to assist the governments of the Republics of North America, Central America, and South America and of the Republics of Cuba, Haiti, Santo Domingo, and the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands and, during war or a declared national emergency, the governments of such other countries as the President deems it in the interest of national defense to assist, in military matters: *Provided*, That the officers and enlisted men so detailed are authorized to accept from the government to which detailed offices and such compensation and emoluments thereunto appertaining as may be first approved by the Secretary of War: *Provided further*, That while so detailed such officers and enlisted men shall receive, in addition to the compensation and emoluments allowed them by such governments, the pay and allowances where-to entitled in the United States Army and shall be allowed the same credit for longevity, retirement, and for all other purposes that they would receive if they were serving with the forces of the United States. (As amended Oct. 1, 1942, ch. 571, 56 Stat. 763.)

I doubt the wisdom of extending the draft to permit such a thing to be done.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. WILSON. In addition to what the Senator from West Virginia has called attention to, I invite attention to the following language from the committee report on Senate bill 1847:

2. The words "to assist other countries in military matters" contained in the present law, if construed literally and exactly, would withhold from the Chief Executive the authority to send military missions to foreign countries for purposes other than direct military assistance, such as, for example, the supervision of elections or the organization of waterways. A similar wording of section 441 (a) of title 34 leads to the same possible restriction in regard to naval missions.

That statement is from a memorandum submitted by the Secretary of State. Are we going to draft our boys to do those things? If we supervise elections, I ask the Senator from Nebraska what are we going to do if a controversy exists after we have supervised an election?

Mr. WHERRY. It will be up to us to enforce our will.

Mr. WILSON. That would not be action by Congress. The President might involve us in a war.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the distinguished Senator from Iowa.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BUTLER obtained the floor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BUTLER. I must attend a committee meeting, and I am compelled to leave the Chamber very shortly.

Mr. HILL. I understood the distinguished Senator from West Virginia to state that the War Department favored the induction of men into the Army, rather than obtaining them by the volunteer system. I rise to challenge that statement. I should like to read to the Senate the testimony of General Eisenhower, who I suppose would be the best spokesman for the Army. If the Senator from Nebraska is in a hurry to go to a committee meeting, I will read this testimony later. However, I did not want any Senator who heard the statement of the Senator from West Virginia to leave the Chamber before I had an opportunity to challenge the statement, if I correctly understood what the Senator from West Virginia said.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. My statement was that regardless of the position taken by the War Department, the actions of the War Department indicated that it wanted selective service. I do not doubt for a moment the statement of General Eisenhower that he prefers a volunteer army to a drafted army. However, the action of the Army in raising the passing grade is a qualification of that statement. General Eisenhower's statement is true, so long as he can obtain volunteers with the qualifications he desires. Of course, he would prefer a volunteer army to a drafted army, but with this qualification: They must be volunteers who pass the test with a mark set by him.

Mr. HILL. Certainly, it must be an army composed of men who are fit to

do the job which the Army requires to be done. We could go through the country and obtain a great many men who have been deferred, who are physically unfit—men with ruptures and other physical disabilities. The Army cannot use many of those men. General Eisenhower does not want those men, and he ought not to be required to take them.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Let me say to the able Senator that I am not speaking of men with ruptures, or men who are physically unfit. I am speaking of physically fit men, who are now required to pass the test with a mark of 70. In time of war they were required to attain a mark of only 59. In other words, the Army is saying to the young men of this country, "You were fully qualified to face the Nation's battles in time of war. We passed you as mentally qualified then. But in time of peace you must pass a higher test of qualifications." I am not speaking of the physically unfit. They do not enter into the question. I am speaking of the mental test. That is the qualification upon the volunteer system that will break it down.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President—

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator from Nebraska has but a limited amount of time at his disposal, I shall not interrupt him.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in connection with what I shall have to say with reference to the bill now under consideration, I wish it distinctly understood that I am definitely in favor of supporting an Army, a Navy, an Air Force, and all other armed services of sufficient size to fulfill all the requirements and obligations of the United States. I believe that the few points which I shall make will answer the questions which have been passing back and forth between various Senators in the past few minutes.

Mr. President, in the debate on the proposed extension of the Selective Service Act, most of the controversy seems to center around the question of how we are to secure about 200,000 additional troops, over and above those already in sight. It is obvious that volunteers will fill almost all, if not all, of our needs. The extension of the Selective Service Act is being considered only because we shall need a comparatively small number of additional troops. The amendment I propose will meet this need.

The British Government has recently announced that it plans to disband the Polish Army units that have been serving under British command since early in the war. These units, composed of about 200,000 men, under command of the Polish General Anders, played a heroic part for the cause of freedom in Tripoli, at Cassino, in the campaigns in France and Germany, and elsewhere. They are trained combat soldiers, and it would be difficult to find better troops anywhere. Although the British Government is urging them to return to Poland, it appears likely that many will be afraid to return to their homeland under its present government.

In an effort to avoid the necessity of extending the draft, I have proposed to the Secretary of War that as many of these men as possible be taken into the

service of the American Army, on either a military or a civilian basis. Secretary Patterson has refused even to seriously consider the suggestion. At this point I should like to read the letter I sent to the Secretary of War and his reply:

APRIL 2, 1946.

HON. ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: My attention has been drawn to news items which indicate that Great Britain intends to disband the Polish Army, Navy, and Air Force units under her control and urge their members to return to Poland.

This seems to me to be our opportunity to secure the services of many thousands of well-trained Polish troops to replace our own boys who have been discharged. Certainly we could hardly find better troops anywhere. These Polish units proved their value in the Battle of Britain, in Africa, at Cassino, in the campaigns in Germany, and in many other places. I do not know where else we could more quickly obtain 200,000 crack troops.

Of course, those who desire to return to their homeland should be given every assistance. But probably many who will be afraid to trust the safe-conduct guarantees of the present-day quisling regime in Poland, will refuse to return to Poland. The least we owe them is a reasonable alternative, in the form of a chance to serve us, particularly when we need trained troops so badly at the present time.

I realize my suggestion involves some questions of foreign policy. I am, therefore, sending a copy to Secretary of State Byrnes, with a request for his comment.

Yours very truly,

HUGH BUTLER,
United States Senator.

Mr. Patterson answered as follows, under date of April 8, 1946:

DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: This is in reply to your letter of April 2, offering the suggestion that members of the Polish armed forces in various countries be permitted to enlist in the United States Army.

I appreciate your thoughtfulness in bringing this suggestion to our attention. The War Department has, however, consistently disapproved the requests of aliens to enlist in the Regular Army and such enlistment is expressly prohibited in Army Regulations. Even though many appealing cases of this nature have been brought to our attention, we have not made exceptions to this prohibition. Such exceptions are believed to be inadvisable at this time and also contrary to the intent of the amendment of the Nationality Act of 1940, contained in the Second War Powers Act, to use enlistment in the Army as a means of authorizing entry into the United States for the purpose of becoming a citizen.

As the above policies have received careful study, it is regretted that the suggestions cannot be approved.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Secretary of War.

To make the RECORD complete, I should also like to read at this point the letter I received from Secretary of State Byrnes on this subject:

MY DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: I have received a copy of the letter you wrote on April 2, 1946, to Secretary Patterson suggesting that members of the Polish armed forces abroad, which are under the control of the British military authorities, be given the opportunity to serve in the United States Army.

You are aware, I am sure, that the British Government has not undertaken to return

these men to Poland against their will. As Foreign Secretary Bevin said in the House of Commons when arrangements to disband the Polish units were announced:

"We are extremely anxious that the Polish troops should return to their own country. As for those who feel in their conscience that they cannot do it, we cannot relieve ourselves of the responsibility for them."

The Secretary of War will undoubtedly inform you of the possibility of admitting these men into the United States Army.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES F. BYRNES.

Mr. President, the reply of the Secretary of War indicates to me that he has not given serious consideration to this proposal. My suggestion would not, of course, give these Polish troops any rights to American citizenship. Furthermore, I do not insist at all that they be enrolled on a military basis. If further study indicates that their use in a strictly military status is undesirable, then I believe consideration should be given to using them as civilian police, or in some similar capacity. Certainly if a way can be found to use them, it may make unnecessary the requested peacetime draft, which so many of our people find objectionable. The War Department should at least make a serious attempt to find some means of using them, rather than to dismiss my suggestion so summarily.

Some study of the legal situation has been made at my request by the office of the legislative counsel, and I am informed that there is now nothing in the statutes that would prohibit enlisting such men, and, further, that there is nothing that would confer any citizenship rights upon them by virtue of their enlistment. So on the basis of these facts, there is no reason why the War Department could not proceed to recruit them without further authorization by the Congress.

It has occurred to me, however, that if it should be decided to take them into our service, there is no particular reason why they should receive all the rights to which our own veterans are entitled. I, therefore, propose to submit an amendment which will cover this point. I should like to have the amendment printed in the RECORD at this point, and I ask unanimous consent to have that done.

There being no objection, the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. BUTLER was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following section:

"SEC. —. (a) The Secretary of War is authorized to enlist not to exceed 200,000 nonresident alien men in the Army of the United States for service outside of the territorial limits of the United States. All enlistments accepted under the provisions of this subsection shall be for the duration of the existing wars and 6 months thereafter, but shall be subject to termination at any time by the Secretary of War.

"(b) The President is authorized to appoint, under the joint resolution of September 22, 1941, as amended, for temporary service in the Army of the United States, such number of company grade commissioned officers as may be required to provide commissioned-officer personnel of company grades for the military units to which the men enlisted under subsection (a) may be assigned. All appointments under the provisions of this section shall be made without term, shall

be terminable at any time by the President, and may be made without regard to the citizenship of the persons appointed.

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of War is authorized to prescribe by regulations the pay and allowances of whatever nature and kind to which the men enlisted or appointed under the provisions of this section shall be entitled. The pay and allowances so prescribed shall not exceed or be of other classes than those authorized by law for personnel of corresponding grades in the Regular Army.

"(d) Of the provisions of law of the United States conferring rights, privileges, or benefits upon any person by reason of the service of such person or any other person in the armed forces of the United States or any component thereof, only those conferring rights, privileges, or benefits upon persons during the time they are on active duty and those listed below shall be deemed to apply to persons for service pursuant to an enlistment or appointment under the provisions of this section:

"(1) The provisions of the act of March 9, 1928 (45 Stat. 251), as amended, relating to funeral expenses;

"(2) Provisions of law authorizing the payment of travel allowances upon discharge or relief from active duty;

"(3) The provisions of the act of December 17, 1919 (41 Stat. 367), as amended, authorizing the payment of a death gratuity equal to 6 months' active duty pay to the dependents of military personnel whose death occurs while on active duty;

"(4) The provisions of the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 (Public Law No. 225, 78th Cong.), except that for the purpose of computing such payments all service shall be compensated for on the same basis as service wholly performed within the United States; and

"(5) The provisions of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration providing for the payment of pensions on account of service-connected disability or death:

Provided further, That the provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, shall not apply to persons who serve in the Army of the United States under the provisions of this section.

"(e) The Secretary of War is authorized to prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to enable him to carry out the provisions of this section."

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, let me take just a few minutes to explain the effect of my amendment. All that it really does is to provide appropriate legislation governing the terms of enlistment, if decision should be made to make use of the services of these men. By that, I mean that they would not receive the benefits of the GI bill of rights, the national service life insurance, pensions, or hospitalization, except for service-connected disability, and so forth. The language of the amendment follows as closely as possible that contained in the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. That amendment covered the rights of persons in the Philippine Scouts who are to serve us in the way that I now propose for the Polish troops. The Senator from Arizona did such a careful and thorough piece of work in delineating what rights should accrue to alien troops in our employ that it seemed unnecessary for me to study that whole issue again. So in my proposed amendment I have simply followed his thought in the matter.

In that connection let me mention the fact that in the Voluntary Recruit-

ment Act that we passed last winter we adopted an amendment, also sponsored by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], which furnishes an exact precedent for my proposal. At that time we decided to recruit 50,000 Filipinos for occupation duty in Japan, and that measure was enthusiastically agreed to by this body as a means of avoiding the drafting of an additional 50,000 American boys. The proposal I have just presented deserves consideration for exactly the same reasons that prompted us to adopt the policy of recruiting Filipinos.

It should be pointed out that this amendment is purely permissive, not mandatory. It merely authorizes; it does not authorize and direct. There may be some substantial reasons why we should not use the services of these troops, although I have not heard any, and the Secretary of War gives no reasons in this letter to me. But, even so, the amendment will not require him to adopt this proposal if, after due consideration, he should decide against it. It does give him clear-cut authority to proceed with the proposal, in case there is any doubt of his authority under present legislation; and it does provide appropriate legislation governing their pay, allowances, and rights. It is contemplated that the men recruited under the terms of this amendment would receive substantially the same pay, allowances, and other benefits that Filipino troops in our service receive.

I expect to call up the amendment at the proper time.

Before a vote is taken I should at least like to remind Senators of these facts: The draft will expire within a short time. Many of us do not want to vote to extend the draft during peacetime. On the other hand we cannot forget the commitments we have undertaken abroad. I believe we are under obligation to provide the Army with the men it says it needs, or else to prove that it does not need them. My proposal at least provides the Secretary of War with an opportunity to secure those men if, after reconsideration, he cannot find any valid excuse to refuse to take them. If, however, the Secretary of War will not take 200,000 crack troops into the service of the Army, even when they are handed to him on a silver platter, I shall be driven to the reluctant conclusion that the Army does not want additional men unless it can draft them.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the gloomy pictures presented to our people in reference to the consequence of our getting into war are more than realized. Even the rabid interventionists do not feel well about the inability of the Allies to get together. There is no world harmony. World War II has not made for peace and justice. At least, it does not appear so on the horizon.

While Pearl Harbor interrupted the discussion between the interventionist and the noninterventionist, the answer as to who was right will have to await the verdict of history. Why? Because in many ways, the world has turned a corner since then. Because of invention and the ingenuity of man, the world has

grown much smaller. Every nation is just around the corner from every other nation.

With the advent of atomic energy, the rocket plane and other inventions—and there are many more on the way—the old methods in war of defense and offense have gone out the window. We need men with prescience, men with vision, as exemplified by "Billy" Mitchell. He was crucified for his foresight.

In this unsettled world, the Nation's first line of defense and offense is in its statesmen—men who comprehend the world picture, and who understand the way of nations; men who will not forget the lessons of history, and who realize that "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure." That statement applies to statecraft as well as to medicine, business, and every other channel of life.

Applying it to the international situation, it means definitely seeking to understand fully the other fellow's viewpoint, calling a spade a spade, and doing everything that is necessary in order to smooth out misunderstandings among the nations.

If human nature is pretty much the same now as it was before Pearl Harbor—and I believe it is—our second line of defense and offense is in our armed forces, backed up by the brains and energy of America. However, those armed forces must be adequate to meet the pattern of today, whatever that pattern may be.

That is why we are discussing today the extension of the Selective Service Act. I presume that from now on when men are inducted into the service, the training which they will receive will be entirely different from the training they received prior to Pearl Harbor. Of course, the men who are to be inducted into the service of their country are entitled to every consideration. But if the situation is as I have already stated, it is the primary purpose of the Selective Service to see to it that our second line of defense and offense is adequate. Every male owes his country, if need be, military service. We know that if we were now to except the teen-agers from the service it would mean that those who are in the service would undoubtedly be held for an extended length of time. Many Senators are receiving telegrams from overseas containing the words "love and kisses." Those telegrams indicate quite clearly the situation with which we are confronted.

I presume that here again we have the same issue which confronted us in connection with the labor bills—the issue which has been neglected time and time again—namely, that public interest is dominant and must be served. We neglected the issue for a long time. In the pending bill we must give consideration to the dominant importance of public interest.

At first I was in doubt about voting for the Johnson-La Follette amendment which provided an increase of 50 percent in pay to the privates. The theory was that men would be induced to enlist because of the higher rate of compensation and therefore would relieve others from being drafted. Undoubtedly it will work that way. But it will also

work to create a standing Army instead of a citizens' force trained like the Swiss and ready at a moment's notice at the call of country. I voted for the amendment only because, of course, at the present time we have millions of trained men who have been discharged from the Army, who in emergency would respond to a call. And there is another reason, namely, that I am hoping that under the United Nations organization we shall, in time, get this world of ours in a more understanding, cooperative, and peaceful mood. However, we shall see what we shall see.

In the meanwhile, the two lines of defense to which I have referred must get into action. Are our statesmen doing all that is necessary in bringing about understanding and harmony, and are our trained personnel in the armed forces adequately meeting the new pattern today? They must all get into action.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I do not wish to delay unnecessarily the business of the Senate. I realize that the Senate voted very decisively yesterday in favor of the Gurney amendment, and that it did not march up the hill yesterday only to turn around and march down the hill today. I realize that the Senate will reject the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia.

A few minutes ago I challenged the statement of the Senator from West Virginia with reference to what is alleged to be the desire of the War Department to take inductees under Selective Service rather than to depend on volunteer enlistments. I referred to the statement of General Eisenhower. I feel that he, better than any other man, can speak for the Army of the United States. I merely wish to read a few brief extracts from the testimony of General Eisenhower before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs on the date of April 8, 1946. At that time he testified in behalf of the pending bill. General Eisenhower said:

The first, retention of selective service, is the only way our Nation can assure itself and the rest of the world that we shall not falter in our obligations; that we are not going to gamble with the commitments we make.

The general stated further:

The Secretary of State appeared before this committee and outlined what the world situation was and how important he thought military strength was in these areas and at home. I feel there is no need of protesting again and again that the Army did not set up those jobs. We merely have to perform them.

In other words, the Army is required merely to carry out the policies and do the jobs set for it by the State Department, the Executive, and the Congress of the United States.

The general continued:

Those commitments made at Potsdam and other places were all made in good faith. The point that concerns us is this: If you go below the strength actually needed to perform them you are very likely to run into trouble.

In other words, you are asking for it. If you have trouble incited by hunger or other motives, in Japan and in Germany, and if you haven't enough people to solve the prob-

lem, then you are in grave trouble, and we will have to use many more men than if we can keep the peace in the first instance.

I believe I told this committee in the closed hearing how seriously General MacArthur looks upon this problem.

Now, the Selective Service Act does assure us of the necessary men to solve the problem. And again I say I would be more than happy to see the language of the extension so worded that we could not take in a single man over and above the estimates we have already given to the Congress.

We carried out the suggestion of General Eisenhower, and we have written it into the bill.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I should like to invite the Senator's attention to the testimony which General Eisenhower gave on January 16, 17, 18, and 19, 1946, before a subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, in which he gave figures and estimates with reference to the number of men needed abroad in all theaters of action. The testimony appears on page 355 of the hearings.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I do not wish to be discourteous to the Senator. The Senator has been over that matter and has submitted figures.

I have not read anything here about figures, and I hope the Senator will let me continue in my own way, and then when I am through, if he wants to return to the figures, he may do so. I do not wish to delay the Senate by going over the figures.

Mr. REVERCOMB. May I give one figure?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The total number of men asked by General Eisenhower, in all theaters abroad, was 794,000.

Mr. HILL. That may be true; the Senator may be entirely correct. We have accepted the over-all figures of General Eisenhower and the War Department, and written them into the bill, and the Senator from West Virginia accepted the same figures, because the Senator from West Virginia wrote the same figures into his amendment, which is now pending. The fact is that is one place where I find sharp disagreement with the Senator from West Virginia. He accepts the figures as to the needs of the Army as declared by General Eisenhower and for the Navy as declared by Secretary Forrestal and other spokesmen for the Navy; but accepting those figures, the Senator from West Virginia in his amendment would deny an opportunity to make sure that these needs are met.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. In reply may I say that I do not take the position that the adoption of the amendment would create such a situation that the figures of the Army and Navy would not be met. I tried to point out this morning that the figures of the War Department—unproved, undelved into, accepted by the Committee on Military Affairs, of which I am a member and the able Senator

from Alabama is a member, accepted as given—can be met without extension of the draft.

Mr. HILL. The Senator, I know, is honest, and he is sincere. He thinks these needs can be met without extending the draft. I hope the Senator is right about it. No one would be happier to see these needs met by the volunteer system than the Senator from Alabama. But I am not willing to gamble in this matter. I am not going to take any chances. I am going to make sure that the machinery is provided whereby these needs can and will be met.

General Eisenhower continues:

Now, there has been much discussion about the numbers of men we need. That, likewise, we have calculated not only on the job, but also taking every favorable outlook we could in order to keep the figure down to the lowest possible number of men.

In other words, General Eisenhower says they have looked at the situation in the most favorable light, and looking at it in the most favorable light, they have kept their needs down in terms of the lowest possible number of men. He continues:

Anyone can see the logic of occupying forces being composed entirely of volunteers if you can possibly get them. There is no one that I know of either in or out of the Army that would rather have selective-service men than volunteers.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. The statement made there as I understand it, is that the general looks forward to the day, or desires the situation, when the occupation troops will be volunteers. He has fixed the sum total of occupation troops, as of July 1 of this year, at 794,000, and today we have more than that many volunteers, and as of July 1 of officers and men, we will have 950,000.

Mr. HILL. That may be true, but because we have 794,000 volunteers today does not mean at all that all the 794,000 volunteers are trained or prepared or ready to go and take their places in the occupying forces. That figure does not mean anything. It may mean that some of these men, although they are trained and prepared, are much more important in the work they are doing here at home than if we sent them across the seas somewhere. We have to organize the Army, not in terms of numbers or figures, but to have the right men in the right places at the right time.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I do not wish to be discourteous, but I desire to get through, because I am anxious that a vote be taken.

The truth is, I will say to my distinguished friend, the Senate of the United States is going to answer this question, and it can answer it better and much more effectively than either the Senator from West Virginia or the Senator from Alabama, and I wish to get to the answer.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I merely wanted the Senator to yield at this point because he has raised a question, and I wanted to clarify the issue.

I may say that the number of volunteers is not 794,000, as the able Senator has stated. As of July, according to the Army's own estimate of the officers and men, it will be 950,000.

Mr. HILL. I took the 794,000 from the Senator from West Virginia, and I now accept his 950,000.

Mr. REVERCOMB. 794,000 is the number required according to General Eisenhower.

Mr. HILL. General Eisenhower continues:

What we are talking about is not gambling with commitments that we have made.

We have presented before the committee our entire record of enlistments and many questions have been raised about the accuracy of the War Department's estimates on voluntary enlistments.

Then he adds:

Our own War Department staff studies present a better estimate, a rosier picture, on this than either of the two studies that were made outside of the staff processes.

In other words, the War Department takes a broader outlook, a rosier outlook, as to the number of volunteers we will be able to get, than two other studies which have been made on this very subject.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] asked General Eisenhower this question:

Your testimony and that of the Secretary of War is in agreement upon this point, that you would much prefer the volunteer to the inductee, and that you do not want to take the young men if you can get away from it?

General EISENHOWER. That is absolutely true.

Mr. President, this will appeal to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] because he is a distinguished businessman, and knows what training and experience mean. General Eisenhower illustrated as follows:

In the Air Forces we have many specialties for which it takes over a year to train a man and in other services there are likewise many which require a long time for training.

You have to find other places in which to put your year and year-and-a-half man, because before you have him trained in those specialties, you have to discharge him.

Senator O'MAHONEY. The Secretary recommended very positively to this committee an increase of incentive for enlistment by increasing the pay.

General EISENHOWER. Yes, sir.

Senator O'MAHONEY. That, apparently, is a War Department policy.

Would there be any objection to the War Department making a suggestion to the committee for inclusion in any bill that may be passed provisions for increased incentive to stimulate enlistments?

General EISENHOWER. No, Senator; the Secretary of War has emphasized that very much. He is very strongly in favor of it. The only reason I haven't talked about it much is that I am talking about the military job I have to do, sir, and I can't tell any more than anyone else what this unknown factor of the 20-percent pay increase will make in our recruiting. I believe in it.

Of course, as the Senate knows, we have gone higher than the 20 percent. We have endeavored to go clear on to the maximum, so far as providing an incentive for enlistment is concerned, through increased pay to be given the men who enlist.

Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate further. We have a very simple question before us. The bill as reported by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, and now pending before the Senate, provides pay incentives such as we wrote into the bill last evening in an effort to do all we could, certainly from the standpoint of pay, to get as many men as possible to enlist. The bill provides that if we can get a sufficient number of volunteers, not a single man will be drafted, and that there shall be induction for service only if, when and where the required needs cannot be met by the volunteer system.

On the other hand, the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia, so far as the induction of men into the military service is concerned would absolutely kill the selective service. It would put an end to selective service so far as any induction of men is concerned. In order for there to be any further inductions, if the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia should be agreed to by the Senate and become the law, the Congress of the United States would have to start all over again and write new legislation.

I hope both Houses of Congress will shortly adjourn, not to be in session again until the third day of January next year. The question is whether before adjourning we will make provision whereby if a sufficient number of men cannot be secured by volunteering it will be possible by induction into the armed forces to meet the needs which no man questions and no man disputes. The question is whether we will put ourselves in a position whereby the Army can fulfill its task and we can meet our commitments, or whether we will go home and gamble, take a chance on the security of our country and on the peace of the world.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I intend my remarks to be very brief. Some points were brought out by the able Senator from Alabama to which I should like to reply. He has quoted some testimony respecting the War Department taking a rosy view of enlistments. I call attention to the testimony to show how rosy has been the view of the War Department respecting enlistments. On September 12, 1945, the Secretary of War stated that the War Department's estimate of enlistments by July 1, 1946, was 300,000, when as a matter of fact by May 1, 1946, the enlistments were 769,340. Was that a very rosy view?

In January of this year General Paul, Chief of Personnel, G-1, on the General Staff, estimated, in this very year of 1946, that the enlistments by July 1 of this year would be 650,000. Yet up to May there have been enlistments of 769,340. Was that a very rosy view of enlistments?

Mr. President, when representatives of the War Department have testified upon this question their view has certainly been very conservative throughout, and not very rosy.

I know that General Eisenhower stated before the committee, and the statement was made in my presence, that he preferred a volunteer army. That statement has never been denied. Of course, he wants a volunteer army. But he wants that army on a selective basis, and, in view of the action taken by the War

Department, I cannot help but feel that, if we leave the selective service as it is today, the Army is going to follow the course already indicated by the order of March 8 in raising their standard to select those they want, and, as General Paul said was intended to be done, to stop some volunteers from coming into the Army.

The Senator from Alabama said the adoption of our amendment would put an end to selective service. I am sure the Senator desires to be corrected with respect to that statement. It would not put an end to selective service. It would keep intact the whole selective-service machinery and the whole selective-service personnel. It would simply stop induction until the further order of the Congress. That is the duty of the Congress. The Congress has a responsibility which it should assume, and which it should not shift to some other department or to the executive side of our Government.

As to Congress adjourning and going home for the year, let me say that if any situation should arise which would require more men in the armed forces, I care not what that situation might be, certainly Congress would reconvene. It could never be so derelict in its duty to the people of the country that upon a few hours' notice it would not reconvene in Washington to meet any situation that might arise.

So, Mr. President, the whole question here is whether Congress shall assume its duty of fixing the policy with respect to the number of men and how the men should be taken into the armed forces, or whether it shall leave that policy open to administration by the War Department.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, before the vote is taken I wish to make a statement. Yesterday I voted against the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] bringing back into the selective service the so-called teen-agers, that is, men from 18 to 20 years of age. When the war was on I voted for the Selective Service Act which enabled the Government to utilize the services of these men of 18 and 19 years. But it seems to me to be altogether a different matter in peacetime and when we are selecting a peacetime Army, which is largely an army for barrack-room duty, whatever anyone may say about it.

As a matter of conscience, Mr. President, for myself, with no purpose to criticize anyone else, I could not vote and did not vote to bring into this peacetime Army men of 18 and 19 years of age.

The pending substitute amendment is an altogether different matter, as I see it. It covers men of all ages, that is, from 18 to 65, or 45, as the case may be, originally covered under the Selective Service Act, but it simply suspends the induction until there is affirmative action taken by the Congress. I do not believe that it would be wise to legislate in that manner at this time, because, much as I regret to see it, the Army has depended not wholly on a volunteer system since the ending of the war in Germany more than a year ago. I think the Army

should have gone back to the theory and concept of a volunteer army as America has always known it, especially in peacetime, and I do not believe it is possible to mix the two systems, the one compulsory and the other voluntary. It will not work well and it cannot work well.

In the committee report on the pending bill I am struck with the statement that:

Both the Army and the Navy want their forces to be made up of volunteers. They desire to have the personnel of the postwar Army and the postwar Navy composed entirely of volunteers, if possible. The people of the country at large wholeheartedly favor the volunteer system for the armed forces.

I myself subscribe to those sentiments, Mr. President. I believe wholeheartedly in a volunteer Army for all peacetime services, for all peacetime activities.

Since I voted against the amendment to include the 18- and 19-year-old young men in the Army, I wish to make a statement because I am not prepared to vote for the substitute amendment. I think the adoption of that amendment would be definitely unwise at this time, because it would serve notice upon other countries which seem to be more or less critical or hypercritical of almost everything that occurs here, that we were ready to abandon our traditional system of raising an effective Army if it were necessary to do so.

In connection with that statement, Mr. President, I wish to make another statement. I am not at all impressed by the statement made in very high places in the Government that the strength of our voice in international affairs, in world affairs, depends upon the strength of our Army and of our Navy. That has never been true of America, and it ought not now to be true, and if it is true it is a pitiable confession that we are not living up to our responsibilities as a nation.

The strength of our voice in international affairs has always depended upon our devotion to right and to justice and upon our willingness to defend what we regarded as the essential and fundamental principles which should guide all nations in their dealings with other nations. Throughout our history we have tried to subscribe to something like what Edmund Burke referred to when he spoke of that justice and sense of justice which is a standing policy of every civilized state.

Mr. President, I do not think the force and power of America depend entirely upon an Army or a Navy. They depend upon the willingness of the American people to support their deeper convictions by bringing into being an Army and a Navy when those principles are at stake. But it is a matter, as I think—although I may be “a voice crying in the wilderness”—of some concern when from high quarters in our Government we are constantly reminded that if we do not have a powerful Army and a powerful Navy we will have no voice in the affairs of this earth.

I do not subscribe to that doctrine, and I never shall. In voting against this substitute proposal I wish it definitely understood that I do not believe that 18- and 19-year-old boys should be con-

scripted for barrackroom duties throughout the world. I do not think it is necessary. But I do think that it would be decidedly unwise to continue upon the statute books the Selective Service Act, with a suspension of inductions under that act, if it be necessary to resort to it. I express the wish and the hope that those in charge of our armed forces, from the commander in chief down, will go back to the volunteer system of raising armies and forces for our various services, because it has been effective in the past except when we were actually facing war or in the midst of war, and it will be effective again. It will be far more effective than the constant hue and cry that we must maintain a tremendous military force upon the backs of the American people to police the world.

The American taxpayer—and by that I mean the American worker, because after all he is a taxpayer—will not for long relish the idea of doing police duty throughout the earth when he finds out how far that kind of activity is going to reduce his standards of living. Fortunately America has largely consisted of a great middle class. By that I mean the workers, the farmers, and the white-collar people about whom we have heard so much recently. People of immense wealth have constituted a mere fringe at the top; and, fortunately for us, those of extreme poverty have constituted no large part of our population. Our population has been made up largely of middle-class people—the worker, the farmer, the white-collar man, the professional man, and the teacher. Two wars in one generation have placed upon the backs of those people a tremendous burden. After a while they will be heard when they see how substantially the American standard of living is going to be lowered by constant police duty all over the earth, perchance on the theory that if we have a large Army we shall have a heavy voice in world affairs.

So, Mr. President, while I was pleased to vote against the amendment which brought the 18-year-old and 19-year-old boys back under the draft, I am equally clear in my conviction that I should vote against the pending proposal for a continuation of the draft, with those same men in it, but suspended so far as inductions are concerned until some emergency may arise.

Mr. President, I am very well aware of the doctrine which prevails in many parts of the world today. It is not very dissimilar to the old doctrine that might makes right. But we went to war against that doctrine. The Nazis were short-lived, and Japan was a short-lived nation when she openly avowed that faith. The strength of America has always been in its devotion to justice and right, in its devotion to fundamental principles, with a firm reliance upon our people themselves to respond in every great emergency to whatever the emergency called for in the way of manpower or military force.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter which I have received from J. W. Studebaker, Commissioner

of Education, as to the percentage of high-school graduates entering and being graduated from college, and the percentage of the total population with college training. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD so that it may be available to the conferees.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION,
Washington, D. C., May 22, 1946.
HON. CHAN GURNEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GURNEY: This is in reply to your recent telephone inquiry concerning the percent of high-school graduates entering and being graduated from college, and the percent of the total population with college training.

In 1942, 16.5 percent of the high-school graduates of 1938 were graduated from college—19.8 percent of the men and 13.7 percent of the women. Of the high-school graduates in 1939, 35.2 percent entered college—44.7 percent of the men and 26.8 percent of the women.

Data taken from the 1940 United States Census show that college graduates constitute 2.9 percent of the entire population, and that 7.1 percent of the population had some college training. When we consider, however, that many persons enumerated in the census are too young to have attained the college level, a comparison of the number of college-trained persons with the population 20 years of age and over seems more pertinent. On this basis 10.8 percent had some college training and 4.4 percent were college graduates.

We are pleased to furnish you with these data and hope that they will serve your purpose.

Cordially,

J. W. STUDEBAKER,
Commissioner.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, if no other Senator wishes to speak at the moment, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hawkes	Overton
Andrews	Hayden	Pepper
Austin	Hickenlooper	Reed
Ball	Hill	Revercomb
Barkley	Hoey	Robertson
Bridges	Huffman	Russell
Briggs	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Brooks	Johnston, S. C.	Shipstead
Buck	Knowland	Smith
Burch	La Follette	Stanfill
Bushfield	Langer	Stewart
Butler	Lucas	Taft
Capehart	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Connally	McFarland	Tobey
Cordon	McKellar	Tunnell
Donnell	McMahon	Tydings
Downey	Magnuson	Vandenberg
Eastland	Maybank	Wagner
Ellender	Mead	Walsh
Ferguson	Millikin	Wheeler
Fulbright	Mitchell	Wherry
George	Moore	White
Green	Murdock	Wiley
Guffey	Myers	Wilson
Gurney	O'Daniel	
Hart	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVER-

COMB], for himself and other Senators, in the nature of a substitute for the bill.

The amendment proposed by Mr. REVERCOMB, as modified, is as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That section 16 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended by striking out 'July 1, 1946' and inserting in lieu thereof 'May 15, 1947': *Provided*, That no individual shall be inducted for training and service under such act unless the Congress by law declares that national security requires that inductions be resumed.

"Sec. 2. (a) There shall be discharged from or relieved from active duty in the military and naval forces of the United States, as rapidly as discharge facilities will permit, every member of such forces, or any component part of either, who applies therefor and who has on the date of enactment of this act one or more children to whom he bears, or would maintain, but for his service, a bona fide family relationship in his home: *Provided, however*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to anyone who has volunteered for service in the Army or the Navy.

"(b) Section 3 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Each man heretofore inducted under the provisions of subsection (a) who shall have served for a training and service period of at least 18 months shall be discharged upon his written application for discharge, as rapidly as discharge facilities will permit: *Provided*, That the foregoing provision shall not apply to any person who has voluntarily enlisted for a longer period of service."

"Sec. 3. This act shall not be deemed to affect the existing program of the Army and Navy for the discharge of men in the service on other grounds, and for other reasons not named in this act, but shall be construed as an additional ground and reason in the demobilization and discharge of servicemen from the Army and the Navy.

"Sec. 4. Any person discharged under the provisions of this act shall be given and granted an honorable discharge, unless for cause found to be not entitled to honorable discharge.

"Sec. 5. The fourth proviso of the second sentence of section 3 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows: *Provided further*, That on July 1, 1946, the number of men in active training or service in the Army shall not exceed 1,550,000, and that this number shall be reduced consistently month by month so that the Army's strength shall be 1,070,000 on July 1, 1947: *And provided further*, That on July 1, 1947, the number of men in active training or service in the Navy shall be 558,000 and in the Marine Corps 108,000.

"Sec. 6. (a) The first paragraph of section 9 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The monthly base pay of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard shall be as follows: Enlisted men of the first grade, \$140; enlisted men of the second grade, \$118; enlisted men of the third grade, \$106; enlisted men of the fourth grade, \$100; enlisted men of the fifth grade, \$90; enlisted men of the sixth grade, \$80; and enlisted men of the seventh grade, \$75. Chief petty officers under acting appointment shall be included in the first grade at a monthly base pay of \$132."

"(b) The provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall become effective on the first day of the first calendar month following its enactment, and no increase in pay for any

period prior thereto shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act.

"Sec. 7. Section 11 of the act of March 4, 1925 (43 Stat. 1274; 34 U. S. C. 701), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 11. That the band of the United States Marine Corps shall consist of one leader whose pay and allowances shall be those of a captain in the Marine Corps; one second leader whose pay shall be \$220 per month and who shall have the allowances of a sergeant major; 10 principal musicians whose pay shall be \$180 per month; 25 first-class musicians whose pay shall be \$150 per month; 20 second-class musicians whose pay shall be \$120 per month; and 10 third-class musicians whose pay shall be \$102 per month; such musicians of the band to have the allowances of a sergeant: *Provided*, That the second leader and musicians of the band shall receive the same increases for length of service and the same enlistment allowance or gratuity for reenlisting as is now or may hereafter be provided for other enlisted men of the Marine Corps: *Provided further*, That the pay authorized herein shall apply in computing the pay of former members of the band now on the retired list and who have been retired since June 30, 1922: *Provided further*, That in the event of promotion of the second leader, or a musician of the band, to leader of the band, all service as such second leader, or as such musician of the band, or both, shall be counted in computing longevity increase in pay: *And provided further*, That hereafter during concert tours approved by the President, members of the Marine Band shall suffer no loss of allowances."

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted in the negative when his name was called.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senate is not in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GURNEY. As I understand, we are voting on the Revercomb amendment as modified, and I understand that a vote "yea" will be in favor of adopting the amendment, and a vote "nay" will be against adoption of the amendment. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. The vote is being taken on the Revercomb amendment, as modified.

The clerk will resume the call of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed calling the roll.

Mr. BUTLER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. WILSON (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who is detained on public business. If he were present he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I should vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CARVILLE], and the Senators from Idaho [Mr. GOSSETT and Mr. TAYLOR] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] are detained on public business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are unavoidably detained.

I also announce that if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The result was announced—yeas 14, nays 63, as follows:

YEAS—14

Brooks	Moore	Taft
Bushfield	Revercomb	Walsh
Capper	Shipstead	Wheeler
La Follette	Stanfill	Wherry
Langer	Stewart	

NAYS—63

Aiken	Gurney	Mitchell
Andrews	Hart	Murdock
Austin	Hawkes	Myers
Ball	Hayden	O'Daniel
Barkley	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Bridges	Hill	Overton
Briggs	Hoy	Pepper
Buck	Huffman	Reed
Burch	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Connally	Knowland	Saltionstall
Cordon	Lucas	Smith
Donnell	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Downey	McClellan	Thomas, Utah
Eastland	McFarland	Tobey
Ellender	McKellar	Tunnell
Ferguson	McMahon	Tydings
Fulbright	Magnuson	Vandenberg
George	Maybank	Wagner
Green	Mead	White
Guffey	Millikin	Wiley

NOT VOTING—19

Bailey	Chavez	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Gerry	Taylor
Bilbo	Gossett	Willis
Brewster	Hatch	Wilson
Butler	Kilgore	Young
Byrd	Morse	
Carville	Murray	

So Mr. REVERCOMB's amendment, as modified, was rejected.

NOMINATION OF SENATOR WARREN R. AUSTIN TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES TO THE UNITED NATIONS AND UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE IN THE SECURITY COUNCIL

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, a few minutes ago I was advised of the appointment of my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Vermont, WARREN R. AUSTIN, to be the representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, with the rank and status of ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary, and the representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

Mr. President, I am no hand at making eulogies; but if I possessed such talent, I should certainly exercise it at this time. We in Vermont have known for many, many years of the ability of WARREN R. AUSTIN. He has represented us in this body for more than 15 years, and during that time the Congress and the entire country have come to recognize his value and worth as a public servant.

We are particularly proud that he has been appointed to this high office at this time. We know that he will be a credit to Vermont, to New England, and to the entire United States, and that through his work and influence the world will be brought nearer to that welcome day when peace shall reign among all nations.

I know that all Members of this body regret that we shall not have the opportunity of working further with him in the Senate, but we do appreciate his appointment to this, one of the most important offices in the world today. While Vermont will sustain a great loss in not having him represent her longer in the Senate, yet Vermont's loss is not only our national gain, but the gain of all nations as well. In behalf of the people of my State, and for myself, I wish publicly to congratulate our colleague, WARREN AUSTIN, on his appointment.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I rise to second the remarks of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] with reference to the great honor which has come to our colleague and friend, WARREN AUSTIN, in the appointment which he has received at the hands of the President of the United States.

New Hampshire adjoins Vermont. The only thing that divides us is H₂O in the form of the Connecticut River. We have much in common.

Mr. President, I have watched WARREN AUSTIN grow in the United States Senate. No man could be better fitted for the grave responsibilities which have been placed upon his shoulders than is WARREN AUSTIN. He has a passion for bringing order out of chaos in a troubled world. So I say with GEORGE AIKEN, congratulations to WARREN AUSTIN and his good wife, who has been his life's helpmate. Congratulations to the Senate, to the people of the entire country, and particularly to the people of the State of Vermont.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I believe the President of the United States has exercised rare judgment in his choice of a representative of the United States to the Security Council. I heartily applaud the selection of Senator AUSTIN to this desperately important responsibility in this critical hour, although I deeply regret his retirement from the Senate.

Senator AUSTIN has been loyal to the true spirit of the United Nations. He has been intimately related to the development of that great institution for international peace and security. He will faithfully sustain its objectives. I particularly like his designation because he has always emphasized his belief in

the fact that the cardinal power of the United Nations lies in its use of pacific authority rather than the ultimate use of force, even though he recognizes the necessity of the final alternative of force if there be no other alternative to choose.

Mr. President, I know that the Senator from Vermont will leave the Senate with the best wishes of all his colleagues. I know that he will be a credit to his country, to the best welfare of which he will continue, as he always has, to be loyal. I congratulate him, and I congratulate America and the work of the United Nations.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise to join in the comments which have been made relative to this appointment of our distinguished friend, the Senator from Vermont. I admit that my feelings are torn by this great honor because it will be hard for us to lose him from this distinguished body of which he has been so distinguished a Member. However, at this tragic time, and in the serious crisis through which we are passing, no person of better qualifications could have been chosen by the President of the United States to represent this country in the Security Council of the United Nations.

I wish to add my word of deep appreciation for the appointment which the President has made of a distinguished Member of our body to represent the United States on the Security Council of the United Nations.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I wish to say that Senator AUSTIN has been a distinguished member of that committee for a number of years.

In the development of the United Nations Charter, the Senator was one of its early supporters. He did not wait to be argued with or convinced of the need for the Charter. He was already convinced of the utility of international cooperation in behalf of all the people.

I regard it as a fortunate circumstance that he has found himself able to accept the high responsibility which the President has placed upon him. It will give him an opportunity to render great service to the world and, in particular, honor and service to the people of the United States. I wish for him a successful career. I know that all of his efforts will be devoted to securing world peace, world security, and world harmony and cooperation. I regret, of course, that he will leave the Senate and the committee over which I have had the honor to preside for several years. I wish him the best of good things in the future. In the discharge of his duties as a member of the committee, he has brought to the aid of his colleagues his great legal knowledge and a wide public outlook. I congratulate him and wish him well in his future career.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I desire to be counted with my colleagues in extending heartiest congratulations to Senator AUSTIN for the distinguished honor which has come to him, and the opportunity it will afford him to render a type of public service which will be perhaps more important than any which

he has had the opportunity of rendering up to the present moment.

Senator AUSTIN has been an outstanding Member of this body. Few, if any, could have matched his industry, his ability, his sense of justice, and his application to the senatorial duties which have devolved upon him. He has made an outstanding record as a Senator from New England, and we are all proud of him, regardless of party affiliations. I am sure that with his training and background, his experience, his learning, and his ability, he will give a magnificent account of himself in the high office to which he has been called.

Senator AUSTIN, on behalf of my colleague and the people of Massachusetts, your neighboring people, I extend heartiest congratulations and best wishes for a most successful and honorable career in the new duties to which you have been called.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, when I think of the political history of the State of Vermont, four names crowd themselves to my mind. I speak of them without disparagement of other distinguished men who have served that State in the Nation's Capital, and brought distinction to themselves and to their constituents.

During the days of the Civil War, Judge Jacob Collamer, of Vermont, represented that State in this body. He was said at that time to be the finest lawyer in the Senate of the United States. He served as a United States Senator, as a Member of the National House of Representatives, and was Postmaster General in the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

Mr. President, another name occurs to me, that of Justin S. Morrill, of Vermont. He served in the National House of Representatives, and in this body. His services in both Houses extended over a span of more than 43 years, one of the longest, if not the longest, spans of continuous service in the two Houses of Congress in the history of our Nation. He was the author of the Tariff Act of 1861 known as the Morrill Act.

Another great name given to the Nation by the State of Vermont was that of George F. Edmunds. He served in the National House of Representatives and in the Senate of the United States. He was, for a time, President pro tempore of this body. He served on the electoral commission and heard the disputed election case of 1876.

Those were three great names.

Mr. President, the fourth name deserving to stand along with the ones I have mentioned is that of our colleague, WARREN AUSTIN. He is learned in the law, and a seeker always of the truth. By his eminent service, his industry, and his rare ability, he has contributed to the clarification of many important issues. He has also rendered to his State and Nation highly important service.

Mr. President, I congratulate him for the appointment which has come to him. I wish for him every good thing in his new field, but I cannot refrain from expressing deepest personal regret in the real sense of loss which comes to us during these trying days in his departure from the Senate of the United States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I cannot refrain from adding another word

of tribute to the character of WARREN AUSTIN. I can think of no person better fitted for the grave and arduous duties which he is about to assume than is he.

For more than 12 years I have had the opportunity of serving with Senator AUSTIN on several committees of the Senate. I have never known him to falter in any issue that was presented.

The task to which he goes is great, but if character and ability and courage and real Americanism can accomplish the task, Senator AUSTIN will succeed.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, it would not be right for me, as chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, to keep my seat at such a time as this. Senator AUSTIN and I have served on this committee together for 14 years, and have stood shoulder to shoulder more than once in supporting measures which have become exceedingly constructive legislation in the evolution of our country.

We have served together on the Committee on Foreign Relations for some time, and worked side by side in handling what now has become recognized international law of a positive sort.

If I should try to describe Senator AUSTIN as a statesman, I would say that from every standpoint his actions and his work would be connected with the word "constructive." If there ever was a constructive statesman in the United States, a man of foresight and understanding, and the ability to put his foresight and understanding into workable language, Senator AUSTIN is that man.

At this time what we need in international relations is a man who has faith in the ability of the people of the world to use reason and law in place of force. In order to bring that about, constructive statesmanship of the first order is needed. I am sure that the President of the United States has made no mistake in his appointment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in 1792 there was a friendly rivalry between Vermont and Kentucky as to which should become the fourteenth State of the Union. By a considerable amount of brain work and some foot work Vermont nosed out Kentucky, as Assault nosed out Lord Boswell in a recent horse race. Since then there has never been any rivalry between the two States except a friendly rivalry, but there has always been a very affectionate association between Vermont and the State of Kentucky.

I am sure that no one here regrets more deeply than do I the loss of the service of Senator AUSTIN as a Member of this body. He has been and is one of the most industrious, fair, sound, level-headed men on either side of the senatorial middle aisle, and he possesses a high degree of thorough understanding of the ethics of public service, not only here, but in any other capacity in which he might serve the American people.

The President could not have made a wiser choice or selected a man whose service would add greater dignity to or confidence in the United Nations than in the appointment of Senator AUSTIN.

I have no right to assume who his successor in the Senate may be when the time comes for the selection, but I would

hope, and I am sure I am not guilty of any impropriety in expressing the hope, that whoever his successor may be, he may approach the high standard of moral and intellectual service, with all the courage and all the inner consciousness of rectitude, which have characterized the services of Senator AUSTIN.

I join the other Members of the Senate in congratulating him, and I join them in regretting his departure from this body.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to join in the tributes which have been paid to our friend, WARREN AUSTIN. For the past 8 years it has been my good fortune to sit with him as a member of the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. Since 1940 continuously through the war, and up to this date, that committee has had before it many momentous, far-reaching questions. WARREN AUSTIN has always been at his post of duty in the committee, contributing his great ability, his fine understanding, and his unyielding devotion.

He has indeed, Mr. President, been a towering figure of strength in the committee and in its work. He has made many contributions to the work of the committee, to the work of the Senate, to the work of the Congress, in the fighting and in the winning of the war.

I, for one, shall sorely miss him, his wise counsel, and his fine, lofty spirit of service. I rejoice that our country is to be represented on the United Nations Council by such a man. I congratulate him, I congratulate the country, I congratulate the United Nations.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, WARREN AUSTIN, our friend and associate, a man of high character, ability, and great experience, has been called by the President to represent this Nation on the Security Council. He will bring to the Council vision and understanding. His background as lawyer, businessman, Senator, student of international affairs and law, especially qualify him for this great position.

Mr. President, the Senate will not seem the same to me after our associate has departed for the Security Council. For a number of years now I have sat to his immediate right in the Senate.

I remember when I came to the Senate about 7½ years ago and first met him. I had heard a great deal about WARREN AUSTIN. I found him friendly, congenial, a man who always had his feet on the ground, and never mentally unpoised. While we did not always vote alike, he has always been considerate and helpful. All through the years as I sat here I found him cooperative, kindly, and, what is more, he always gave me a sense of strength. So, Mr. President, I think he will be a source of strength to the Security Council.

A few nights ago, when it was announced in the newspapers that Mr. Stettinius had resigned, I sat back in my chair and thought over who might take his place, and immediately the name of WARREN AUSTIN came to my mind. Now he has been appointed. He knows history. He knows people. He has "what it takes" for the performance of his duties in this high office.

Mr. President, I am happy for Senator AUSTIN, because this appointment presents great challenges and I know he will prove adequate. I believe he will strengthen the Security Council by being the representative of this Government on it, and at this time, when the world is in the chaotic condition in which it finds itself, men of Vermont character are needed. Vermont is the old Granite State. We need men who have convictions, men who have judgment, and men who stand by their judgment. Such a man is WARREN AUSTIN.

I congratulate the United Nations, Mr. President, for having the services of this man.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President and my generous colleagues, I accept your remarkable friendship, and I reciprocate the sentiments which you have so lavishly expressed to me. It would be trite for me to attempt to express in words my gratitude to you, and I need not say that it tears my heartstrings to leave the Senate of the United States. There are at least 95 golden threads which will always be pulling me toward the very dear friends with whom I have had the honor to associate in this great deliberative body.

I need not say that my life is enriched by these expressions from you of your confidence in me, and as this opportunity comes to me to serve further a cause to which I have been entirely devoted, you give me strength. I am sure you increase whatever power I may have by way of persuasion, or leadership perhaps, to help in the attainment of such a condition in the world that peace will prevail because of the interest of all the great and small nations of the earth in seeing to it that never again shall war be employed as a means of determining international controversies and disputes.

Mr. President, I realize the responsibility I am assuming; I have some idea of the difficulties that are about to confront me; but I assure you that I go with such determination to work for the cause and such will to throw everything I have and that God may give me in the future into that cause that I fear it not. When my associates, companions, and friends come to me and say, "Awful glad that you have this appointment if you want it," I say, "I want it." It is like a divine dispensation that I should have at this time in my life and experience the opportunity to serve my country and serve mankind in this special way.

EXTENSION OF SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1940

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (S. 2057) to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, until May 15, 1947, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I believe it was the intention of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] to offer an amendment. I do not see him on the floor. I am told he has withdrawn the amendment.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consideration of House bill 6064 and

that the Senate bill, as it is now perfected, be substituted for it, and that the House bill be passed in that form.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6064) to extend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. GURNEY. I ask unanimous consent that all after the enacting clause of the House bill be stricken out and that the language of the Senate bill as perfected be substituted therefor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the House language will be stricken, and the Senate language substituted therefor.

The question is on the engrossment of the amendment, and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. GURNEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BUTLER (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. Not knowing how he would vote on this question, I withhold my vote.

Mr. BURCH (when Mr. BYRD's name was called). The senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is detained on official public business. If present he would vote "yea." He has a pair on this question with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], who, if present, would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CARVILLE], and the Senators from Idaho [Mr. GOSSETT and Mr. TAYLOR] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] are detained on public business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are unavoidably detained.

I also announce that if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CARVILLE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] would vote "yea."

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANFILL] is unavoidably detained. If present he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILKINS], who would vote "nay," is paired on this question with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 68, nays 9, as follows:

YEAS—68

Alken	Gurney	Murdock
Andrews	Hart	Myers
Austin	Hawkes	O'Daniel
Ball	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Barkley	Hickenlooper	Overton
Bridges	Hill	Pepper
Briggs	Hoey	Reed
Brooks	Huffman	Robertson
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Burch	Johnston, S. C.	Saltanstill
Bushfield	Knowland	Smith
Capehart	La Follette	Taft
Connally	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Cordon	McCarran	Tobey
Donnell	McClellan	Tunnell
Downey	McFarland	Tydings
Eastland	McKellar	Vandenberg
Ellender	McMahon	Wagner
Ferguson	Magnuson	Wheeler
Fulbright	Maybank	White
George	Mead	Wiley
Green	Millikin	Wilson
Guffey	Mitchell	

NAYS—9

Capper	Revercomb	Thomas, Okla.
Langer	Shipstead	Walsh
Moore	Stewart	Wherry

NOT VOTING—19

Bailey	Chavez	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Gerry	Stanfill
Bilbo	Gossett	Taylor
Brewster	Hatch	Willis
Butler	Kilgore	Young
Byrd	Morse	
Carville	Murray	

So the bill (H. R. 6064) was passed.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, as one member of the Committee on Military Affairs which reported this bill to the Senate, and speaking for all its members, I wish to say that we appreciate the support given the measure, and we thank the members of the Senate for that support.

I now ask unanimous consent that House bill 6064 be printed, showing the Senate amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GURNEY. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. HILL, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. AUSTIN, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. GURNEY conferees on the part of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, Senate bill 2057 will be indefinitely postponed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1538. An act for the relief of Robert J. Cramer;

H. R. 3094. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United

States to consider and render judgment on the claim of the Zephyr Aircraft Corp. against the United States;

H. R. 3641. An act for the relief of M. Martin Turpanjian;

H. R. 3967. An act for the relief of Ahto Walter, Lucy Walter, and the legal guardian of Teddy Walter, a minor; and

H. R. 4400. An act for the relief of Nolan V. Curry, individually, and as guardian of his minor son, Hershel Dean Curry.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 210. An act for the relief of Jackson Williams, Mrs. Lora Sally Williams, the legal guardian of Garry E. Williams, a minor, and the legal guardian of James Williams, a minor;

H. R. 3018. An act for the relief of R. Fred Baker and Crystal R. Stribling;

H. R. 3100. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Rolland Lee Frank, a minor;

H. R. 3781. An act for the relief of Mabel M. Fischer; and

H. R. 5407. An act to grant the Federal Works Administrator certain powers with respect to site acquisition, building construction, purchase of buildings, and other matters.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 874. An act for the relief of L. Wilmoth Hodges;

H. R. 941. An act for the relief of Mrs. C. A. Lee, administratrix of the estate of Ross Lee, deceased;

H. R. 2223. An act for the relief of Catherine Bode; and

H. R. 3808. An act for the relief of the estate of William N. Therriault and Millicent Therriault.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused from the Senate until the 26th of June.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate for the remainder of the sessions this week.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the session of the Senate tomorrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for permission to be absent from the Senate for 10 days.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate on official business from Friday until next Wednesday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted.

ORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2177, Calendar No. 1427.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2177) to provide for increased efficiency in the legislative branch of the Government.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Special Committee on the Organization of Congress, with amendments.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the bill which is now the unfinished business of the Senate is the end product of more than a year of study, hearings, and deliberations conducted by the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress created pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 18. The committee was created in response to a widespread congressional and public belief that a grave constitutional crisis exists in which the fate of representative government itself is at stake.

Public affairs are now handled by a host of administrative agencies headed by nonelected officials, with only casual oversight by Congress.

The committee held 39 public hearings and 4 executive sessions between March 13 and June 29, 1945. The testimony of 102 witnesses was taken, 45 of whom were Members of the Congress. In addition, 37 Members and many interested private citizens submitted written statements. A review of all the testimony received reveals a wide area of agreement among the witnesses with respect both to the conditions which handicap Congress in the efficient performance of its proper functions and with respect to appropriate remedies for those defects.

The joint committee submitted its report on March 4, 1946. On May 13 I introduced Senate bill 2177, which was referred to the Special Committee on the Organization of Congress, created by a special resolution of the Senate to consider the recommendations of the joint committee. The measure to all intents and purposes, and with a few very minor exceptions, incorporates the recommendations contained in the report of the joint committee to which I have referred.

One group of proposals contained in the measure deals with the strengthening of the policy-making functions of the Congress. Because of the volume and the specialized character of the work with which both branches of the Congress must now deal, we have logically delegated to the standing committees of the Senate the initial work of policy making in connection with those measures. Those committees have had a long, distinguished, and useful history since the Senate was first organized. There have been several major and minor reorganizations of the congressional committee system through the years, as new problems have arisen and old problems have disappeared. The system, however, has not been revamped to meet modern conditions, since 1921.

It is my opinion and that of all members of the joint committee, as well as

the special committee, that the time has come when we must make a thoroughgoing reorganization of the committee structure of the Senate. I have served in this body for more than 20 years. I have seen the growth in complexity of our problems, both domestic and foreign, until today we find ourselves confronted with a tidal wave of intricate and difficult problems affecting both foreign and domestic issues, which makes it impossible under our present multiplicity of committees, with overlapping jurisdictions, and the multiplicity of service by Senators upon those committees, to discharge our enormous tasks adequately under present circumstances.

Today there are more than twice as many committees in the Senate as there are principal divisions of public policy. Responsibility for legislative action is scattered among 33 standing committees. Under the present system, as I see it, there is no way to coordinate the activities of those 33 committees.

To remedy this situation the pending measure proposes to simplify the committee structure and, insofar as practical, to correlate it with the departments and agencies of the Federal Government. It has not been possible, I should state very frankly, to secure a complete coordination of the 16 standing committees which are proposed in this measure with the departments of government; but insofar as that has been practicable, a sincere effort has been made in that direction.

Senators will find on page 3 of the report a list of the committees proposed in this measure, together with the committees which are proposed to be abolished and absorbed by the 16 new reorganized committees. I shall name them for the RECORD. The 16 new committees are Agriculture and Forestry, Appropriations, Armed Services, Banking and Currency, Civil Service, District of Columbia, Expenditures in Executive Departments, Finance, Foreign Relations, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Judiciary, Labor and Public Welfare, Public Lands, Public Works, Rules and Administration, and Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. President, I think every Senator realizes that the burden of committee work upon Senators is especially onerous in this body. At present the combined membership of all the standing committees in the Senate is 481, and of the 11 major committees is 220.

In addition, there are now 10 special committees of the Senate with a total membership of 87. Altogether the 96 Members of this body occupy 568 seats on its standing and special committees, or an average of 6 committee places for each Senator.

In the House of Representatives, as Senators will recall, there are several exclusive committees, so-called; and according to practice, a Member of the House of Representatives serving on an exclusive committee may not serve on any other major committee of the House of Representatives.

But today in the Senate no Senator serves on less than three committees. In fact, 1 Senator sits on 10 committees,

and many serve on 7, 8, or 9. In short, under our present structure the burden of committee work has become almost unbearable.

I do not say this in any sense of criticism, but I am sure that many other Senators have had the same experience I have had in finding it impossible to attend all the sessions of all the committees upon which we serve. Hardly a day goes by in any week that I do not find on my desk two or three or sometimes four notices of committee meetings, all being held at the same time on the same day. Obviously, under such circumstances it is impossible for Senators to attend all their committee meetings and to follow through on the consideration of legislative measures before the committees in such a way as would be desirable not only from the standpoint of the Members of the Senate themselves, but also from the standpoint of the work and service which they could render to the Senate, to their constituencies, and to the country. If we simplify the committee system and make it possible for them to give more continuous and exclusive attention to the committees upon which they serve, this condition will be corrected.

Mr. President, in this measure we have proposed for the first time in the history of the rules of the Senate to define the jurisdiction of the reorganized committees. Under the practice of the Senate, the jurisdiction of committees has grown up in part as a result of their names and in part because of the general field of legislation which they normally would cover. Committees have also acquired jurisdiction simply because they have had the power to initiate a particular piece of legislation, especially in a new field. As a result of this practice, the jurisdictional lines between our committees are confused not only because they overlap, but also because of the practice of having jurisdiction attach to a particular committee if by chance it may have considered original legislation in some new field. Through the years, as the activities of the Federal Government have grown in scope and complexity, the result has been, naturally, to complicate an already complicated situation insofar as jurisdictional conflicts between the present committees are concerned.

It is in the hope of simplifying that situation and, insofar as possible, of anticipating and avoiding future conflicts of jurisdiction that we have attempted in this measure to spell out the jurisdiction of the standing committees which we propose. After many years of observation and after several years of intensive study, I am convinced that the reorganization of the committee structure of the Senate is the keystone of the arch of improving the efficiency of this body in discharging its tremendous legislative responsibilities in the modern world.

Having proposed the best plan we could find after long study, and assuming the reorganization of the committees, we then propose to improve the staff facilities of the committees in order to enable them better to discharge their responsibility in the field of their jurisdiction. For that purpose, the measure

provides for the appointment to each committee of four experts in its subject-matter field. The bill recommends that the experts, when appointed, shall be certified as well qualified for their work and shall have tenure of office on good behavior and satisfactory performance of their duties. Furthermore, Mr. President, we propose that the Appropriations Committee shall have four staff experts for each one of its standing subcommittees, because of the enormous work load they carry.

Having proposed to strengthen the staff facilities available to the committees, the measure also proposes to increase the staff and the services of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, in order that it may provide additional aid to the committees when they are in periods of peak operation and activity, as well as to provide increased research facilities and service to the individual members of the House and Senate.

In order to help relieve the Members of Congress of the tremendously increased load which has come upon them as a result of the broadened activities of the Federal Government, we are also proposing in this measure, Mr. President, the appointment in the office of each Senator and each Member of the House of Representatives of a high-caliber administrative assistant to perform non-legislative duties and departmental work, insofar as possible, of the Members of the Congress, and to give them, therefore, more time for the study and consideration of national legislation.

Senate bill 2177 also provides for improving the policy-determining machinery of the Congress by regularizing committee procedure as regards hearings, meetings, and records. It would expedite the reporting and would clarify the understanding of measures submitted to the Senate from committees. We define the powers of committees and we deny to the committees permission to sit while the Senate or House is in session, except by special permission, with the exception of the Committee on Rules, of the House of Representatives.

We also propose to strengthen the rule insofar as conference committees are concerned, in an effort to confine them to matters in disagreement between the two Houses, and we propose the outlawing of legislative riders on appropriation bills.

With a view to crystallizing the determination of party policy on major issues and to strengthen party government as an offset to organized pressure groups, we provide in this measure for the establishment of majority and minority policy committees in each House of Congress. Each of these four policy committees would be chosen at the beginning of each new Congress by the respective majority and minority conferences of the two Houses. They would consist of seven members each.

It has been evident to all those interested in and concerned about efficient Government, that because of the separation of powers in our Constitution the gap between the executive and the legislative arms of the Government has been

growing and widening throughout the years. The Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, and the special Senate committee, recognized this situation and made a proposal contained in the pending measure which we believe will go a long way toward bridging the gap between the legislative and executive arms of the Government. We are proposing the creation of a Joint Legislative-Executive Council to consist of the majority policy committees in both Houses, and of the President and members of his Cabinet, or such of them as he may wish to designate to serve on the Joint Legislative-Executive Council.

I am convinced, Mr. President, that if this proposal becomes law and is put into effect, it will go far in helping to mitigate the periodic deadlocks which occur between the Executive and the Congress, and which have caused dangerous crises in the conduct of the Federal Government. I believe that such a council would tend to strengthen coordination and cooperation between the two branches. Naturally no institutional procedure can be found to bridge the gap to which I refer unless there is a willingness and good will on both sides of it. But in recent years we have seen that much may be accomplished by even an informal arrangement which brings together the executive branch of the Government and the policy-making committees of the Senate. I refer, of course, to the experience of the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations which met initially at the invitation of former Secretary of State Hull to consider the Dumbarton Oaks proposal.

Not only the Senators who served on that subcommittee, but, I believe, all other Senators have full knowledge of the important function that cooperative relationship between the Secretary of State and the Foreign Relations Committee performed in helping to work out initially the proposal which was submitted at Dumbarton Oaks and subsequently in the almost unanimous ratification of the United Nations Charter. I am happy to say that that informal cooperation, if I may term it such, progressed further as a result of the action of the Secretary of State in taking the distinguished Senator from Texas, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. CONNALLY], and the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], of the same committee, with him to Paris as his advisers at the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers; and he will take them with him again when the Council reconvenes on the 15th of the present month.

Mr. President, what I envision in a joint legislative-executive council is the opportunity for coordination and collaboration in many of the fields of domestic as well as foreign policy. Not that the policy committees would be drawn into the administration of the law, which is an executive responsibility, but consultation with the congressional policy committees by the Executive and his Cabinet during the formulative stage of legislation would make for more harmonious relations.

We likewise suggest that in connection with matters of foreign policy and other issues of high national importance, the minority policy committees might be drawn in for consultation by the joint legislative-executive council.

Mr. President, I suggest to the majority leader that perhaps, in view of the late session of the Senate last evening, we should recess now. Tomorrow I shall attempt to summarize the other principal provisions of the bill. I wonder if the Senator from Kentucky believes that we could meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; definitely.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I would appreciate it very much if the Senate would meet at that time.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAYDEN in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Harry J. Anslinger, of Pennsylvania, to be the United States representative in the Commission on Narcotic Drugs of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

NOMINATION PASSED OVER—DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles Fahy to be legal adviser of the Department of State.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the nomination will have to be passed over once more on account of the absence of the Senator who is interested in it. I hope to dispose of it without unnecessary delay.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles Ulrick Bay to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Norway.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Raymond Michael Foley to be Federal Housing Administrator in the National Housing Agency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTER

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Samuel J. Leach to be postmaster at Hersey, Mich.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harry Hawkins Vaughan to be major general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the Navy nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Navy nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the Marine Corps nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified at once of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be forthwith notified.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, June 6, 1946, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 5 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for promotion in the Regular Corps of the United States Public Health Service:

Joseph E. Unsworth, assistant dental surgeon, to be senior assistant dental surgeon, effective January 3, 1946.

Carl E. Johnson, assistant dental surgeon, to be senior assistant dental surgeon.

IN THE NAVY

Midshipman Arthur H. Barlow to be an assistant paymaster in the Navy with the rank of ensign, from the 5th day of June 1946.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following-named employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the positions indicated:

To be hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of commander in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, from the dates indicated: Casper M. Durgin, June 1, 1946.

William D. Patterson, July 1, 1946.

To be hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant commander in the

Coast and Geodetic Survey, from the dates indicated:

Clarence A. Burmister, April 1, 1946.

Percy L. Bernstein, June 1, 1946.

James D. Thurmond, July 1, 1946.

To be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer with rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, from the dates indicated:

A. Gordon Anderson, December 24, 1945.

John O. Boyer, December 24, 1945.

Wilbert M. Hellman, December 24, 1945.

Gerald L. Short, January 18, 1946.

John O. Phillips, January 18, 1946.

Robert D. Singel, February 11, 1946.

John E. Schultz, April 7, 1946.

Edwin A. Dörner, April 7, 1946.

Robert C. Darling, June 10, 1946.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 5 (legislative day of March 5), 1946:

FOREIGN SERVICE

Charles Ulrick Bay to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Norway.

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY

Raymond Michael Foley to be Federal Housing Administrator in the National Housing Agency for a term of 4 years from June 30, 1946.

IN THE ARMY

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Harry Hawkins Vaughan to be a major general.

IN THE NAVY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

Robert B. Carney to be vice admiral, for temporary service.

Robert N. Barker to be ensign from June 5, 1946, in lieu of appointment as an assistant paymaster in the Navy with the rank of ensign as previously nominated and confirmed.

Raymond W. Sitz to be assistant paymaster with the rank of ensign from June 5, 1946, in lieu of appointment as a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps as previously nominated and confirmed.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS

Robert H. Wilson	Richard B. Cropley
William T. Sweetman	Donald J. Gehri
Gilbert Percy	Edward R. Agnew, Jr.
Judson C. Richardson,	Thomas J. Bardon
Jr.	Charles L. Schroeder
Thomas D. Stockwell,	John N. Snapper
Jr.	Byron C. Allison

POSTMASTER

MICHIGAN

Samuel J. Leach, Hersey.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 5, 1946

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou eternal God, who art man's unflinching friend, may we now be lifted by the mighty tides of Thy spirit into the glad assurance that Thou art willing and able to supply our many needs.

We are bringing unto Thee our sins and shortcomings, our failures and follies, our perils and perplexities, and all the dark and confused areas of our lives, praying that our minds and hearts may be purged and empowered for the tasks and responsibilities of this new day.

Grant that we may meet each challenging experience with strength of soul and release from all tension. May discouragement, despair, and defeatism be supplanted by determination, courage, and hope. Give us joy and peace in believing that the prospects for the final triumph of truth and righteousness are as radiant and glorious as the promises of the Lord God Omnipotent.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1776. An act to authorize the exchange of certain land at the Benicia Arsenal, Calif.

The message also announced that the President pro tempore has appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following Departments and Agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Department of War.
4. Federal Communications Commission.
5. General Accounting Office.
6. National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.
7. Petroleum Administration for War.
8. United States Railroad Retirement Board.

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 650) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That GEORGE D. O'BRIEN of the State of Michigan, be and he is hereby, elected chairman of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on the Post Office and Post Roads.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement made before the Senate Committee on Labor and Education by Harry Reuther, president, UAW-CIO.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my re-

marks in the RECORD and include a very able address delivered by my distinguished colleague from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS] on last Saturday at the ceremony held in the Library of Congress on the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the admission of the State of Tennessee to the Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

ARMY MEDICAL LIBRARY

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, on June 3 the New York Times carried an article relative to the plans announced by Maj. Gen. Norman T. Kirk, the Surgeon General of the Army, calling for a new Army Medical Research and Graduate Training Center. These plans include an Institute of Pathology, a School of Global Medicine, and a special general hospital of 1,000 beds to receive men with rare maladies where these can be studied and cures possibly found. Both military and civilian specialists will treat these patients.

The Army Institute of Pathology serves not only the Army but the Veterans' Administration and other Government agencies, as well as the civilian medical world as does the extraordinarily fine medical museum of the Institute of Pathology. Increasing its capacity will add much to all these services.

The Army Medical Library is the finest in the world, and I have been one of those who have joined with the Army medical man in anxiety over an adequate home for these wonderful books. Nothing must be allowed to prevent the consummation of this plan for its security.

It is with the greatest enthusiasm that I welcome the announcement, and hope that this Congress will recognize the far-reaching benefits that will accrue from such a center and take steps to bring it into being.

INCREASED PENSIONS TO CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE REGULAR ARMY, NAVY, MARINE CORPS, AND COAST GUARD

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 3908) to provide increased pensions to members of the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard who become disabled by reason of their service therein during other than a period of war.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I just want to compliment our chairman for bringing out this bill. I think it is a grand bill and we should all go along with it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph II of part II of Veterans' Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"II. For the purposes of part II, paragraph I (a) hereof, if the disability results from injury or disease—

"(a) If and while the disability is rated 10 percent the monthly pension shall be \$10.35.

"(b) If and while the disability is rated 20 percent the monthly pension shall be \$20.70.

"(c) If and while the disability is rated 30 percent the monthly pension shall be \$31.05.

"(d) If and while the disability is rated 40 percent the monthly pension shall be \$41.40.

"(e) If and while the disability is rated 50 percent the monthly pension shall be \$51.75.

"(f) If and while the disability is rated 60 percent the monthly pension shall be \$62.10.

"(g) If and while the disability is rated 70 percent the monthly pension shall be \$72.45.

"(h) If and while the disability is rated 80 percent the monthly pension shall be \$82.80.

"(i) If and while the disability is rated 90 percent the monthly pension shall be \$93.15.

"(j) If and while the disability is rated as total the monthly pension shall be \$103.50.

"(k) If the disabled person, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered the anatomical loss or loss of use of one foot, or one hand, or blindness of one eye, having only light perception, the rate of pension provided in part II, paragraph II, subparagraphs (a) to (j), shall be increased by \$31.50 per month; and in the event of anatomical loss or loss of use of one foot, or one hand, or blindness of one eye, having only light perception, in addition to the requirement for any of the rates specified in subparagraphs (l) to (n), inclusive, of part II, paragraph II, as herein amended, the rate of pension shall be increased by \$31.50 per month for each such loss or loss of use but in no event to exceed \$270 per month.

"(l) If the disabled person, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered the anatomical loss, or loss of use of both hands, or both feet, or of one hand and one foot, or is blind in both eyes, with 5/200 visual acuity or less, or is permanently beridden or so helpless as to be in need of regular aid and attendance, the monthly pension shall be \$180.

"(m) If the disabled person, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered the anatomical loss or loss of use of two extremities at a level, or with complications, preventing natural elbow or knee action with prosthesis in place, or has suffered blindness in both eyes, rendering him so helpless as to be in need of regular aid and attendance, the monthly pension shall be \$211.50.

"(n) If the disabled person, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered the anatomical loss of two extremities so near the shoulder or hip as to prevent the use of a prosthetic appliance or has suffered the anatomical loss of both eyes, the monthly pension shall be \$238.50.

"(o) If the disabled person, as the result of service-incurred disability, has suffered disability under conditions which would entitle him to two or more of the rates provided in one or more of the subparagraphs (l) to (n), inclusive, of part II, paragraph II, of this regulation, no condition being considered twice in the determination, or has suffered total deafness in combination with total blindness with 5/200 visual acuity or less, the monthly pension shall be \$270.

"(p) In the event the disabled person's service-incurred disabilities exceed the requirements for any of the rates prescribed herein, the Administrator, in his discretion, may allow the next higher rate or an intermediate rate, but in no event in excess of \$270."

SEC. 2. The increased rates provided by this act shall be effective from the first day of the first month following the passage of this act, and shall be deemed to include the 15 percent increase in the rate of compensation or pension payable for service-incurred disability under Public Law 469, Seventy-eighth Congress, December 7, 1944.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 4, line 17, strike out "first month" and insert "second month."

PURPOSES OF THE LEGISLATION

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. The general purposes of the legislation is to liberalize the now existing benefits payable to peacetime veterans for service-connected disabilities. At the present time, peacetime veterans are receiving approximately 75 percent of the monthly rates now being paid to war veterans for similar service-connected disabilities. The present peacetime pension rates range from \$8.62 per month for a 10-percent disability to \$86.25 per month for total disability and up to \$225 per month for specific disabilities. War veterans receive \$11.50 per month for a 10-percent disability and \$115 per month for total disability and up to \$300 per month for specific disabilities. The bill under consideration would increase the pension rates of peacetime veterans from \$8.62 per month to \$10.35 per month for a 10-percent disability and from \$86.25 per month for total disability to \$103.50 per month and up to \$270 per month for specific disabilities. Your committee is of the opinion that the 90-percent ratio is equitable in light of all the facts presented to the committee.

COST OF THE LEGISLATION

The Veterans' Administration has estimated that this bill would affect approximately 38,800 peacetime veterans at a minimum cost of \$3,445,000 for the first year.

EXPLANATION OF THE AMENDMENT

The amendment on page 4, line 15, of the bill provides that the effective date be on the first day of the "second month" following the enactment instead of the first day of the "first month." General Bradley advised the committee at the hearing on May 7 that if the bill were enacted late in the month, the Veterans' Administration would find it impractical to effectuate the increases as promptly or as efficiently as would be the case if the effective date were fixed as the first day of the second month following the passage of the act. General Bradley suggested this amendment and your committee agreed with him.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BIEMILLER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the

RECORD and include a speech by Hon. Thurman Arnold.

REV. HARVEY H. SPRINGER

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include a copy of a letter and a copy of a telegram.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, on May 13 on the floor of the House I decried the fact that one Harvey Springer was to testify before the Committee on Un-American Activities. As I stated at that time, he was a supporter of Gerald B. Winrod, one of the defendants in the sedition trial, and Gerald L. K. Smith. It has been called to my attention that Torrey M. Johnson, president of Youth for Christ, has written to Mr. Springer as follows:

FEBRUARY 4, 1946.

Rev. HARVEY H. SPRINGER,

Englewood, Colo.

DEAR Mr. SPRINGER: I am enclosing for your information a copy of a telegram which we sent to the press last July.

Youth For Christ is 100 percent a religious organization and strictly nonpolitical. We want nothing whatever to do with you, Gerald Winrod, Gerald L. K. Smith, Kenneth Goff, or any men of your character.

We resent your intrusion upon a purely spiritual work with your political axes, and other things which you have to grind.

We have repudiated you—we do now repudiate you—and we will forever repudiate men of your character and conduct.

Most sincerely yours,

TORREY M. JOHNSON,

President.

The telegram referred to follows:

WINONA LAKE, IND., July 27, 1945.

It has come to our attention that a so-called American Youth for Christ under the wing of Gerald L. K. Smith and headed by a Carl Mote has been formed.

We want to inform you that Youth for Christ International, an organization now headed by Dr. Torrey Johnson, of Chicago, newly elected president, whose convention has just closed at Winona Lake, Ind., has never had and does not now have and will not have anything to do with any organization headed by Gerald L. K. Smith or any other figure who uses religion to help grind his political axes. We have always felt that religion and politics do not mix.

We have had no relationship whatsoever to Gerald L. K. Smith or any other pseudo political groups and do not intend to have any in the future.

Yours respectfully,

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE,

YOUTH FOR CHRIST INTERNATIONAL.

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, which reported out the bill creating the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, I wish to express gratification with the choice of

Mr. Eugene Meyer, of Washington, as head of the new institution.

His broad background of financial experience, and his long service in various Government capacities, together with his independent mind, fit him preeminently for this assignment.

He is one of a too limited class of Americans who, having achieved a financial competency, is willing to enter the public service, and be exposed to the criticism and, oftentimes, abuse that in a democratic society comes down on the head of a public official.

At his age, it would be natural for him to choose the easier path of a private citizen, but, instead, he demonstrates that he is willing to give the last precious years of his life to the service of free government, which has given the opportunity to him for success in so many fields.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article which appeared in last month's issue of the National Grange Monthly entitled "On the Industrial Front."

Mr. HART asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address delivered in Jersey City by Mr. Joseph F. Stack, commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address by Maj. Gen. Glenn A. Edgerton before the National Association of Purchasing Agents in Chicago on May 29.

GOV. EARL WARREN, OF CALIFORNIA, REPUBLICAN "WHITE HOPE" FOR 1948

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to announce that my most distinguished constituent, Gov. Earl Warren, yesterday probably captured both nominations for the governorship of California. This feat, thought impossible, makes him the No. 1 man for the Republican nomination for President in 1948.

Why did Governor Warren so captivate the electorate that the voters in both parties picked him as their candidate? Briefly, here are the reasons: He was an excellent governor; he did not play partisan politics in putting over his program; he is absolutely honest and will carry out his promises; he has courage; and finally he has that human touch that makes people have confidence in him.

He was opposed by a strong man, Attorney General Kenny. Kenny was the darling of the ultraliberals and was considered a great vote getter. He sought to belittle Governor Warren, but every attack proved to be a boost for the Governor and an endorsement of the program he carried out. The people knew their Governor and his record.

They had such confidence in him that yesterday they assured his reelection by making him the nominee of both parties.

Not since 1914, when Hiram Johnson was reelected, has California reelected a governor.

THE BRITISH LOAN

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, each Member of this Congress owes \$2,000 on the \$275,000,000 public debt. Each Member has about 300,000 people in his district and each one of those constituents owes \$2,000. That means that each congressional district owes \$600,000,000 of the debt. Now they are asked to give \$30 more each to make this loan a gift to Great Britain. How many of your constituents want to do it? Ask them. That means that you are going to burden your own people with \$9,000,000 more debt in each congressional district. What do you think your people are going to say when you obligate them for an additional sum of \$9,000,000 as a gift? Now, remember, this is not going to be paid back, because in this proposal to make this loan you are canceling what we lent them, or furnished them under lend-lease. You thought we were going to get it back, but we are going to cancel it just as I said would happen. The proposed loan will be a gift, we all know that, so let us admit it without fooling our people. It may mean our downfall financially. We cannot afford to take such chances. We should prohibit the State Department and Treasury Department from entering into such agreements for and on behalf of our people. This is bureaucratic government of the first magnitude and of the gravest consequences to our national welfare.

Congress, you will wreck America unless you defeat this gift. I ask you where are you going to get the money? Spend your money in America helping the American people to get the things they need. Americans need all the help you can give them.

CHESTER BOWLES AND HIS GANG SHOULD QUIT

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, Chester Bowles and his gang should quit. Last night over the radio he gave a perfect example of one whose sins had found him out. Slashing out in every direction in an attempt to defend himself he surpassed any of his previous efforts to distort the facts and to deceive the American people.

Claiming that he had prevented inflation by holding the line, he at the same time decried the fact that burning in-

flation was raging everywhere in the country.

Maintaining that his policies as to price control were wise and proper, he admitted that he had been compelled to increase prices of many commodities.

Acknowledging that he and his gang were losing their fight, he sought to rally the veterans to his aid by artful misrepresentation. He would have them believe that Congress was waging a terrific fight to abandon rent control. He must have known that this is not true. He failed to tell them how many new houses he and those of his viewpoint have ready for occupancy by veterans.

If the theories and practices of Chester Bowles and Paul Porter have been successful and should be continued, pray tell me why the whole country cannot get bread, butter, and meat—the three most necessary commodities.

Never before have I heard any bureaucrat abuse the Senate of the United States with the arrogance which he displayed last night. He is not an elected official of the Government and should not assume to abuse those who have been elected by the people of their respective sovereign States to represent them in matters of legislation.

Chester Bowles has become badly inflated. He should be deflated by Congress and his resignation demanded.

NOLAN V. CURRY

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4400) for the relief of Nolan V. Curry, individually, and as guardian for his minor son, Hershel Dean Curry, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out all after "to" over to and including "accident" in line 8 on page 2 and insert "the legal guardian of Hershel Dean Curry, a minor, the sum of \$1,000 for the personal injuries sustained by said Hershel Dean Curry as the result of an accident which occurred on January 21, 1945, on Hemphill Street in Fort Worth, Tex., involving an Army vehicle."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Hershel Dean Curry, a minor."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MABEL M. FISCHER

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3781) for the relief of Mabel M. Fischer, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, after "Fischer," insert "and to Nora M. Steinmetz, widow of Frank L. Steinmetz, each."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "her husband" and insert "their husbands."

Page 1, line 8, after "Fischer" insert "and Frank L. Steinmetz."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of Mabel M. Fischer and Nora M. Steinmetz."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

M. MARTIN TURPANJIAN

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3641) for the relief of M. Martin Turpanjian, with Senate amendment thereto, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$1,186" and insert "\$2,500."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JACK WILLIAMS AND MRS. LORA SALLY WILLIAMS

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 210) for the relief of Jack Williams and Mrs. Lora Sally Williams, with Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Jackson" and insert "Jack."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of Jack Williams; Mrs. Lora Sally Williams, the legal guardian of Garry E. Williams, a minor, and the legal guardian of James Williams, a minor."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT J. CRAMER

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1538) for the relief of Robert J. Cramer, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$5,122.22" and insert "\$3,051.61."

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AHTO WALTER ET AL.

Mr. **McGEHEE**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3967), for the relief of Ahto Walter, Lucy Walter, and Teddy Walter, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$3,200" and insert "\$2,630.55."

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

R. FRED BAKER AND CRYSTAL R. STRIBLING

Mr. **McGEHEE**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3018) for the relief of R. Fred Baker and Crystal R. Stribling, with Senate amendments thereto and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "R. Fred Baker the sum of \$350 and to pay."

Page 1, line 6, after "Stribling", insert ", of Columbia, S. C."

Page 1, lines 6 and 7, strike out "both of Columbia, S. C."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "property damage."

Page 1, line 9, after "injuries", insert "sustained by her."

Page 1, line 9, after "expenses", insert "incurred."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "a collision with an" and insert "an accident involving an."

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of Crystal R. Stribling."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ZEPHYR AIRCRAFT CORP.

Mr. **McGEHEE**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3094) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claim of the Zephyr Aircraft Corp. against the United States, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of the Zephyr Aircraft Corp., as successor to the Lenert Aircraft Corp., against the United States for compensation for damage, injury, and losses suffered by the said Lenert Aircraft Corp., because of the refusal by officials of the War Department to make a contract with the said Lenert Aircraft Corp. in compliance with section 10 of the act of July 2, 1926 (44 Stat. 784), pursuant to a design competition for the procurement of primary training planes, which was projected by circular proposal 39-635, dated March 11, 1939.

"Sec. 2. In the determination of such claim, the United States shall be held liable for damages, and for any act committed by any of its officers or employees, to the same extent as if the United States were a private person.

"Sec. 3. Suit upon this claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the passage of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time, laches, the form and content of protest, and supporting papers thereof. Proceedings upon the determination of such claim and appeals from the payment of any judgment thereon, shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which the court has jurisdiction under section 145 of the Judicial Code, as amended."

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPH E. BENNETT

Mr. **McGEHEE**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2091) for the relief of Joseph E. Bennett, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. **McGEHEE**, Mr. **HEDRICK**, and Mr. **JENNINGS**.

ANDRE DACHARRY

Mr. **McGEHEE**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2192) for the relief of Andre Dacharry, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. **McGEHEE**, Mr. **JENNINGS**, and Mr. **COMBS**.

FEDERAL WORKS ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. **LANHAM**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5407) to grant to the Federal Works Administrator certain powers with respect to site

acquisition, building construction, purchase of buildings, and other matters, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, lines 9 and 10, strike out "to purchase and remodel buildings", and insert "to purchase buildings either unencumbered or subject to existing leases where in his determination it is advantageous to do so and to remodel the same."

Page 2, strike out lines 5 and 6, and insert "the unobligated balances of appropriations heretofore made for the construction of projects outside the District of Columbia are hereby made available for this purpose."

Page 2, strike out all after "\$2,000,000" down to and including "purpose," in line 10, and insert "Funds for this purpose are hereby made available from the unobligated balances of appropriations heretofore made for the construction of buildings outside the District of Columbia."

Page 5, line 22, after "apply" insert "to communications systems for handling messages of a confidential or secret nature, or."

Page 5, line 24, after "operated" insert "or occupied."

Page 6, strike out lines 3 to 11, inclusive.

Page 6, line 12, strike out "9" and insert "8."

Page 6, line 22, strike out "10" and insert "9."

Page 7, line 11, strike out "11" and insert "10."

Page 7, line 22, strike out "12" and insert "11."

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. **RICH**. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the Senate amendments? Is the committee satisfied with the Senate amendments?

Mr. **LANHAM**. Yes; insofar as this request for agreement is concerned. This is a bill which was passed unanimously by the House. The Senate struck out one provision of the bill and improved the language of one or two other provisions. The only new provision in it is with reference to exchanging one site for another out in the district represented by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. **ANGELL**].

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. **GATHINGS** asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the **RECORD**, and further to extend his remarks and include an editorial from the Indianapolis Star.

Mr. **JENSEN** asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the **RECORD** and include an editorial from the Woodbine Twiner about John McKinney, national champion speller.

Mr. **FARRINGTON**. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I was given permission to include in the Appendix of the **RECORD** a speech by the former Secretary of the

Interior. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the Record and will cost \$140, but I ask that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article by Dr. F. S. Hammett, urging legislation in behalf of governmental aid to the war against cancer, which appeared in the Provincetown (Mass.) Advocate on the 29th of May.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. This is Calendar Wednesday, Mr. Speaker. I submit that the only business before the House that may be considered is the call of committees.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is sustained. However, the Chair desires first to make an announcement.

EXERCISES IN COMMEMORATION OF THE LIFE, CHARACTER, AND PUBLIC SERVICE OF THE LATE FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 152, Seventy-ninth Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the joint committee to make arrangements for the joint session to be held on Monday, July 1, 1946, for appropriate exercises in commemoration of the life, character, and public service of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt, the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. BULWINKLE, Mr. WALTER, Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois, Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, and Mr. LEFEVRE.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HALE (at the request of Mr. HERTER) for June 6 and 7, to attend a meeting of the governing board of Bowdoin College whereof he is a member.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1717. An act for the development and control of atomic energy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

BILL AND A JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROGERS of New York, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a

bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4510. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact between Colorado and New Mexico with respect to the waters of Costilla Creek; and

H. J. Res. 340. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution creating the Niagara Falls Bridge Commission.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MARCANTONIO and Mr. BIE-MILLER demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 103, nays 199, not voting 128, as follows:

[Roll No. 141]

YEAS—103

Abernethy	Gathings	O'Hara
Allen, La.	Gifford	Pace
Almond	Gore	Patman
Andrews, Ala.	Gossett	Peterson, Fla.
Barden	Grant, Ala.	Peterson, Ga.
Bates, Ky.	Gregory	Pickett
Beckworth	Hare	Poage
Bell	Harris	Pratt
Bland	Hays	Price, Fla.
Bonner	Hébert	Priest
Boykin	Hendricks	Rains
Brooks	Hobbs	Rankin
Brown, Ga.	Jarman	Richards
Bryson	Jennings	Riley
Bulwinkle	Johnson, Ill.	Rivers
Camp	Johnson,	Robertson, Va.
Cannon, Fla.	Luther A.	Rockwell
Cannon, Mo.	Johnson,	Roe, Md.
Chelf	Lyndon B.	Rogers, Fla.
Clark	Kerr	Russell
Cooley	Kilburn	Short
Cooper	Lanham	Sikes
Cox	Larcade	Smith, Va.
Cravens	Lyle	Stockman
Crawford	McGehee	Tarver
Davis	McKenzie	Thomas, Tex.
Domeneaux	McMillan, S. C.	Thomason
Doughton, N. C.	Maloney	Trimble
Drewry	Manasco	Weaver
Earthman	Mansfield, Tex.	West
Eaton	May	Whitten
Fisher	Mills	Whittington
Flannagan	Morrison	Wickersham
Folger	Murray, Tenn.	Worley
Gary	Norrell	Zimmerman

NAYS—199

Adams	Clippinger	Gillette
Allen, Ill.	Coffee	Gillie
Andresen,	Cole, Kans.	Goodwin
August H.	Cole, Mo.	Gorski
Andrews, N. Y.	Cole, N. Y.	Graham
Angell	Corbett	Granahan
Arends	Crosser	Grant, Ind.
Arnold	Curtis	Green
Auchincloss	D'Alesandro	Griffiths
Baldwin, N. Y.	De Lacy	Gross
Barrett, Pa.	Delaney,	Gwinn, N. Y.
Barrett, Wyo.	James J.	Gwynne, Iowa
Bates, Mass.	Delaney,	Hale
Bender	John J.	Hall,
Bennet, N. Y.	D'Ewart	Edwin Arthur
Biemiller	Dingell	Hand
Blackney	Dondero	Harless, Ariz.
Bloom	Douglas, Ill.	Harness, Ind.
Bolton	Doyle	Hart
Boren	Eberhart	Havenner
Bradley, Mich.	Elston	Healy
Bradley, Pa.	Engel, Mich.	Henry
Brehm	Fallon	Hertel
Buck	Feighan	Heselton
Buffett	Fenton	Hess
Butler	Flood	Hill
Byrnes, Wis.	Fogarty	Hinshaw
Carlson	Forand	Hoch
Carnahan	Gallagher	Hoeven
Case, S. Dak.	Gamble	Holmes, Mass.
Celler	Gavin	Holmes, Wash.
Chiperfield	Geelan	Hope
Church	Gerlach	Horan
Clevenger	Gillespie	Howell

Huber	Madden	Rodgers, Pa.
Hull	Mansfield,	Rogers, Mass.
Jenkins	Mont.	Rogers, N. Y.
Jensen	Marcantonio	Rooney
Johnson, Calif.	Martin, Mass.	Rowan
Johnson, Okla.	Mason	Ryder
Jonkman	Mathews	Sabath
Judd	Michener	Sadowski
Kearney	Miller, Calif.	Savage
Kee	Miller, Nebr.	Scribner
Keefe	Monroney	Simpson, Pa.
Kelley, Pa.	Morgan	Smith, Maine
Kelly, Ill.	Murdock	Smith, Wis.
Kinzer	Murray, Wis.	Somers, N. Y.
Kirwan	Neely	Springer
Klein	Norblad	Starkey
Knutson	O'Brien, Ill.	Stigler
Kopplemann	O'Brien, Mich.	Sullivan
Kunkel	O'Konski	Taber
Landis	Outland	Talbot
Lane	Philbin	Talle
Latham	Phillips	Thom
LeCompte	Pittenger	Tibbott
LeFevre	Powell	Traynor
Lemke	Price, Ill.	Voorhis, Calif.
Lesinski	Quinn, N. Y.	Walter
Lewis	Rabin	Wasielewski
Link	Ramey	Weichel
Lynch	Randolph	Wigglesworth
McConnell	Rayfield	Wilson
McCowan	Reed, N. Y.	Wolcott
McDonough	Resa	Wolverton, N. J.
McGregor	Rich	Woodhouse
McMillen, Ill.	Robison, Ky.	Woodruff

NOT VOTING—128

Andersen,	Gardner	Plumley
H. Carl	Gearhart	Rabaut
Anderson, Calif.	Gibson	Reece, Tenn.
Bailey	Gordon	Reed, Ill.
Baldwin, Md.	Granger	Rees, Kans.
Barry	Hagen	Rizley
Beall	Hall,	Robertson,
Bennett, Mo.	Leonard W.	N. Dak.
Bishop	Halleck	Robinson, Utah
Brown, Ohio	Hancock	Roe, N. Y.
Brumbaugh	Hartley	Sasser
Buckley	Hedrick	Schwabe, Mo.
Bunker	Heffernan	Schwabe, Okla.
Byrne, N. Y.	Hoffman	Shafer
Campbell	Holifield	Sharp
Canfield	Hook	Sheppard
Case, N. J.	Izac	Sheridan
Chapman	Jackson	Simpson, Ill.
Chenoweth	Johnson, Ind.	Slaughter
Clason	Jones	Smith, Ohio
Clements	Kean	Sparkman
Cochran	Kefauver	Spence
Colmer	Keogh	Stefan
Combs	Kilday	Stevenson
Courtney	King	Stewart
Cunningham	LaFollette	Sumner, Ill.
Curley	Lea	Summers, Tex.
Daughton, Va.	Luce	Sundstrom
Dawson	Ludlow	Taylor
Dirksen	McCormack	Thomas, N. J.
Dolliver	McGlinchey	Tolan
Douglas, Calif.	Mahon	Torrens
Durham	Mankin	Towe
Dworshak	Martin, Iowa	Vinson
Elliott	Morrow	Vorys, Ohio
Ellis	Mundt	Vorsell
Ellsworth	Murphy	Wadsworth
Elsaesser	Norton	Weich
Engle, Calif.	O'Neal	White
Ervin	O'Toole	Winstead
Fellows	Patrick	Winter
Fernandez	Patterson	Wolfenden, Pa.
Fuller	Pfeifer	Wood
Fulton	Ploeser	

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Taylor.
 Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Ploeser.
 Mr. McGlinchey with Mr. Wadsworth.
 Mr. King with Mr. Schwabe of Missouri.
 Mr. Pfeifer with Mr. Jones.
 Mr. Byrne of New York with Mr. Hoffman.
 Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Schwabe of Oklahoma.
 Mr. Cochran with Mr. Halleck.
 Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Vorys of Ohio.
 Mr. Colmer with Mr. Shafer.
 Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Fuller.
 Mr. Gordon with Mr. Elsaesser.
 Mr. Sparkman with Mr. Stefan.
 Mrs. Douglas of California with Mr. Fellows.

Mr. Patterson with Mr. Ellsworth.
Mr. Tolan with Mr. Stevenson.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Dworshak.
Mr. Torrens with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. H. Carl Andersen.
Mr. Hook with Mr. Dolliver.
Mr. McCormack with Mr. Anderson of California.
Mr. Izac with Mr. Bennett of Missouri.
Mr. Wood with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Jackson with Mr. Beall.
Mr. Roe of New York with Mr. Reed of Illinois.
Mr. Slaughter with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mr. Hendricks with Mr. Bishop.
Mr. Lea with Mr. Johnson of Indiana.
Mr. Bailey with Mr. Fulton.
Mr. O'Neal with Mr. Clason.
Mr. Barry with Mr. Brumbaugh.
Mr. Spence with Mr. Chenoweth.
Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Martin of Iowa.
Mr. Bunker with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Durham with Mr. Mundt.
Mr. Elliott with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Combs with Mr. Simpson of Illinois.
Mr. Engle of California with Mr. Reed of Kansas.
Mr. Courtney with Mr. Smith of Ohio.
Mr. Gardner with Mr. Rizley.
Mr. Dawson with Mr. Sundstrom.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Welch.
Mr. Daughton of Virginia with Mr. Cunninghamham.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. DOUGHTON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 651) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That ELIZA JANE PRATT of the State of North Carolina be, and she is hereby, elected a member of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives: Pensions, Territories, Flood Control.

The resolution was agreed to.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present now.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 142]

Allen, Ill.	Clements	Fuller
Andersen, H. Carl	Cochran	Fulton
Anderson, Calif.	Colmer	Gardner
Baldwin, Md.	Combs	Gearhart
Bates, Ky.	Courtney	Gibson
Beall	Cox	Gordon
Bennett, Mo.	Cunningham	Granger
Bishop	Curley	Hagen
Bonner	Daughton, Va.	Hale
Boykin	Dawson	Hall
Brown, Ohio	Dirksen	Leonard W.
Brumbaugh	Dolliver	Halleck
Buckley	Douglas, Calif.	Hartley
Bunker	Durham	Hedrick
Campbell	Dworshak	Heffernan
Canfield	Elliott	Hobbs
Case, N. J.	Ellis	Hoffman
Case, S. Dak.	Ellsworth	Hook
Chapman	Elsaesser	Izac
Chenoweth	Engle, Calif.	Jackson
Clason	Ervin	Jenkins
	Fernandez	Johnson, Ind.

Jones	Outland	Smith, Ohio
Kean	Pace	Sparkman
Kefauver	Patrick	Spence
Keogh	Patterson	Stefan
Kilday	Pfeifer	Stevenson
King	Ploeser	Stewart
LaFollette	Plumley	Summers, Tex.
Lea	Pratt	Sundstrom
Luce	Rabaut	Taylor
Ludlow	Reece, Tenn.	Thomas, N. J.
Lyle	Rizley	Tolan
McCormack	Robertson,	Torrens
McGlinchey	N. Dak.	Towe
Mahon	Robinson, Utah	Vinson
Mankin	Roe, N. Y.	Vorys, Ohio
Martin, Iowa	Sabath	Vursell
May	Schwabe, Mo.	Wadsworth
Marrow	Schwabe, Okla.	Welch
Monroney	Shafer	White
Mundt	Sharp	Winstead
Murphy	Sheppard	Winter
Norton	Sheridan	Wolfenden, Pa.
O'Neal	Simpson, Ill.	Wood
O'Toole	Slaughter	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 260 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to know whether these bills to be called on Calendar Wednesday are to be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. There has been no business transacted as yet. The Clerk will call the committees.

The CLERK. The Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the point of order raised by the gentleman from Mississippi is purely dilatory. Under section 10, rule XVI of the House, the Chair having just announced that a quorum is present, it is obvious that the point of order made by the gentleman from Mississippi is a purely dilatory motion and should not under the rules of the House be entertained by the Speaker.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion it does not lie within the province of any Member of the House to criticize or impugn the motive of any other Member when he makes a point of order in connection with any procedure on the floor of the House. Important legislation is contemplated being taken up and I observe on the floor at present that evidently there is not a quorum present and I therefore make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair, of course, has the right under certain circumstances to hold that motions are dilatory but a point of no quorum is a question of

very high privilege. The Chair will not state what he will do at other times. The gentleman makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirty-three Members are present; not a quorum.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 143]

Andersen, H. Carl	Gibson	Ploeser
Anderson, Calif.	Gordon	Plumley
Andrews, N. Y.	Gossett	Poage
Arnold	Granger	Pratt
Bailey	Gregory	Rabaut
Baldwin, Md.	Hagen	Rains
Bates, Ky.	Hall	Reece, Tenn.
Beall	Leonard W.	Richards
Bennett, Mo.	Halleck	Riley
Bishop	Hartley	Rizley
Boykin	Hedrick	Robertson,
Brown, Ohio	Heffernan	N. Dak.
Brumbaugh	Hendricks	Robinson, Utah
Buckley	Hobbs	Roe, N. Y.
Buffett	Hoffman	Russell
Bulwinkle	Hook	Schwabe, Mo.
Bunker	Izac	Schwabe, Okla.
Campbell	Jackson	Shafer
Canfield	Jarman	Sharp
Cannon, Mo.	Jennings	Sheppard
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Ind.	Sheridan
Celler	Johnson,	Simpson, Ill.
Chapman	Luther A.	Slaughter
Chenoweth	Jones	Smith, Ohio
Clark	Kean	Sparkman
Clason	Kefauver	Spence
Clements	Keogh	Stefan
Cochran	Kerr	Stevenson
Colmer	Kilburn	Stewart
Combs	Kilday	Stockman
Courtney	King	Summer, Ill.
Cox	Kinzer	Summers, Tex.
Crawford	LaFollette	Sundstrom
Cunningham	Lanham	Taylor
Curley	Lea	Thomas, N. J.
Daughton, Va.	Luce	Thomas, Tex.
Dawson	Ludlow	Tolan
Dirksen	Lyle	Torrens
Dolliver	McCormack	Towe
Douglas, Calif.	McGlinchey	Trimble
Drewry	Mahon	Vinson
Durham	Maloney	Vorys, Ohio
Dworshak	Mankin	Wadsworth
Elliott	Martin, Iowa	Weaver
Ellis	Mundt	Welch
Elsaesser	Murphy	West
Engle, Calif.	Murray, Tenn.	White
Ervin	Norton	Whittington
Fernandez	O'Neil	Winstead
Fisher	O'Toole	Winter
Fuller	Outland	Wolfenden, Pa.
Fulton	Pace	Wood
Gardner	Patrick	Woodhouse
Gearhart	Pfeifer	Woodruff

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 272 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Those Members desiring the yeas and nays will rise and remain standing until counted. [After counting.] Forty-five Members have risen. The Chair, in looking over the membership since the announcement that 272 had answered, notes that 45 is more than one-fifth of the Members present now.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER. The yeas and nays are ordered.

The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 286, nays 19, not voting 125, as follows:

[Roll No. 144]

YEAS—286

Abernethy, Geelan, Mathews
Adams, Gerlach, May
Allen, Ill., Gifford, Michener
Allen, La., Gillespie, Miller, Calif.
Almond, Gillette, Miller, Nebr.
Andresen, Gillie, Mills
August H., Goodwin, Monroney
Andrews, Ala., Gore, Morgan
Angell, Gorski, Morrison
Arends, Gossett, Murdock
Auchincloss, Graham, Murray, Tenn.
Bailey, Granahan, Murray, Wis.
Barden, Grant, Ala., Neely
Barrett, Pa., Green, Norblad
Barrett, Wyo., Gregory, Norrell
Barry, Griffiths, O'Brien, Ill.
Bates, Ky., Gross, O'Brien, Mich.
Bates, Mass., Gwynn, N. Y.
Beckworth, Gwynne, Iowa
Bell, Hagen, O'Hara
Bender, Hale, O'Konski
Biemiller, Hancock, Pace
Blackney, Hare, Patman
Bland, Harness, Ind., Patterson
Bloom, Harris, Peterson, Fla.
Bolton, Hart, Peterson, Ga.
Bonner, Havenner, Phillips
Boren, Hays, Pickett
Boykin, Healy, Powell
Bradley, Mich., Hébert, Pratt
Bradley, Pa., Hendricks, Price, Fla.
Brehm, Henry, Price, Ill.
Brooks, Herter, Priest
Brown, Ga., Hess, Quinn, N. Y.
Bryson, Hill, Rabin
Buck, Hinshaw, Rains
Bulwinkle, Hobbs, Ramey
Byrne, N. Y., Hoeven, Randolph
Byrnes, Wis., Holifield, Rankin
Camp, Holmes, Mass., Rayfel
Cannon, Fla., Holmes, Wash., Reed, Ill.
Cannon, Mo., Hope, Reed, N. Y.
Carlson, Horan, Rees, Kans.
Case, S. Dak., Howell, Rees
Celler, Huber, Rich
Chelf, Jarman, Richards
Chiperfield, Jenkins, Riley
Church, Jennings, Robertson, Va.
Clark, Jensen, Robison, Ky.
Clements, Johnson, Ill., Rockwell
Clevenger, Johnson, Rodgers, Pa.
Clippinger, Luther A., Roe, Md.
Coffee, Johnson, Rogers, Fla.
Cole, Kans., Lyndon B., Rogers, Mass.
Cole, Mo., Johnson, Okla., Rogers, N. Y.
Cooley, Judd, Rooney
Cooper, Kearney, Rowan
Corbett, Kee, Russell
Cox, Keefe, Ryter
Cravens, Kelley, Pa., Sabath
Crawford, Kelly, Ill., Sadowski
Crosser, Kerr, Sasser
Curtis, Kilburn, Savage
D'Alesandro, Kinzer, Scrivner
Davis, Kirwan, Short
De Lacy, Sikes, Sikes
Delaney, Knutson, Smith, Va.
James J., Kopplemann, Smith, Wis.
Delaney, Kunkel, Somers, N. Y.
John J., Landis, Springer
D'Ewart, Lane, Starkey
Dingell, Larcade, Stigler
Domengeaux, Latham, Stockman
Dondero, LeCompte, Sullivan
Doughton, N. C., LeFevre, Taber
Douglas, Ill., Lemke, Talbot
Doyle, Lewis, Talle
Drewry, Link, Tarver
Earthman, Lyle, Thom
Eaton, Lynch, Thomas, Tex.
Eberharter, McConnell, Thomason
Ellsworth, McCormack, Tibbott
Elston, McCowen, Traynor
Engel, Mich., McDonough, Trimble
Fallon, McGehee, Vursell
Felghan, McGregor, Walter
Fenton, McKenzie, Wasielewski
Fisher, McMillan, S. C., Weaver
Flannagan, McMillen, Ill., Weiher
Flood, Madden, West
Fogarty, Maloney, Whittington
Folger, Manasco, Wickersham
Forand, Mansfield, Wolcott
Gallagher, Mont, Woliverton, N. J.
Gamble, Mansfield, Tex., Woodhouse
Gary, Marcantonio, Worley
Gathings, Martin, Mass.
Gavin, Mason

NAYS—19

Arnold, Hand
Baldwin, N. Y., Harless, Ariz.
Butler, Heselton
Carnahan, Hoch
Cole, N. Y., Hull
Grant, Ind., Jonkman
Hall, Martin, Iowa
Edwin Arthur Pittenger

Poage
Rivers
Smith, Maine
Wilson

NOT VOTING—125

Andersen, Gearhart
H. Carl, Gibson
Anderson, Calif., Gordon
Andrews, N. Y., Granger
Baldwin, Md., Hall
Beall, Leonard W.
Bennet, N. Y., Halleck
Bennett, Mo., Hartley
Bishop, Hedrick
Brown, Ohio, Heffernan
Brumbaugh, Hoffman
Buckley, Hook
Buffett, Izac
Bunker, Jackson
Campbell, Johnson, Calif.
Canfield, Johnson, Ind.
Case, N. J., Jones
Chapman, Kean
Chenoweth, Kefauver
Clason, Keogh
Cochran, Kilday
Colmer, King
Combs, LaFollette
Courtney, Lanham
Cunningham, Lea
Curley, Lesinski
Daughton, Va., Luce
Dawson, Ludlow
Dirksen, McGilchney
Dolliver, Mahon
Douglas, Calif., Mankin
Durham, Merrow
Dworschak, Mundt
Elliott, Murphy
Ellis, Norton
Elsaesser, O'Neal
Engle, Calif., O'Toole
Ervin, Patrick
Fellows, Pfeifer
Fernandez, Ploeser
Fuller, Plumley
Fulton, Rabaut
Gardner, Reece, Tenn.

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Baldwin of Maryland with Mr. Campbell.

Mr. Zimmerman with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Sumners of Texas with Mr. Canfield.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Sharp.

Mr. Voorhis of California with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.

Mr. Stewart with Mr. Case of New Jersey.

Mr. Chapman with Mr. Gearhart.

Mr. Robertson of Virginia with Mr. Ellis.

Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Hancock.

Mr. Ervin with Mr. Robertson of North Dakota.

Mrs. Mankin with Mr. Kean.

Mr. Ludlow with Miss Sumner of Illinois.

Mr. Gibson with Mrs. Luce.

Mr. Mahon with Mr. Merrow.

Mr. Lanham with Mr. Towe.

Mr. Kilday with Mr. Winter.

Mr. Granger with Mr. Woodruff.

Mr. Kefauver with Mr. Buffett.

Mr. Murphy with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. BAILEY, Mr. BARRY, Mr. HUBER, Mr. LANE, Mr. ANGELL, Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin, Mr. COFFEE, Mr. ARENDS, Mr. BENDER, Mr. CORBETT, Mr. D'EWARD, Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa, Mr. CLIPPINGER, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan, Mr. KEARNEY, Mr. CHIPERFIELD, Mr. LECOMPTE, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. REES of Kansas, and Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, the motion just made is a dilatory motion and I should like to be heard on it.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, it is always in order to move to adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts has made a point of order and the Chair is going to hear him.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard in opposition to the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, in ruling on the point of order I realize fully that entire discretion is vested in the Chair in reaching a decision as to whether a motion is a dilatory motion or is not a dilatory motion.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, this is a very important question. The very able gentleman from Massachusetts is addressing the House and I think the Members ought to be here to hear him. I therefore make the point of order there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count, and he will count all those leaving the Chamber.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Can the Chair count those who are leaving?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I made the point of order they were dilatory in not getting out sooner.

The SPEAKER (after counting). Two hundred and ten Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion for a call of the House.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RANKIN) there were—ayes 81, noes 13.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is not required in this instance.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. There is confusion as to what we are voting on. As I understand, we are voting on a motion to adjourn.

The SPEAKER. No. A call of the House has been ordered.

The Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. The point of no quorum was made by the gentleman from Mississippi, was it not?

The SPEAKER. The House has ordered a call of the House. A roll call is in order, and the Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. Is this the situation, that a quorum was not present when last reported; that the doors are locked and the Sergeant at Arms is out notifying absent Members?

The SPEAKER. That is correct. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 145]

Andersen, H. Carl	Gardner	Pratt
Anderson, Calif.	Gearhart	Rabaut
Andrews, N. Y.	Gibson	Reece, Tenn.
Baldwin, Md.	Gordon	Richards
Beall	Granger	Rizley
Bennet, N. Y.	Gregory	Robinson, Utah
Bennett, Mo.	Hall	Roe, N. Y.
Bishop	Leonard W.	Russell
Bloom	Halleck	Sabbath
Bonner	Hartley	Schwabe, Mo.
Boykin	Hébert	Schwabe, Okla.
Brown, Ohio	Hedrick	Shafer
Brumbaugh	Heffernan	Sharp
Buckley	Hobbs	Sheppard
Buffett	Hoffman	Sheridan
Bunker	Hook	Simpson, Ill.
Campbell	Izac	Simpson, Pa.
Canfield	Jackson	Slaughter
Celler	Johnson, Calif.	Smith, Ohio
Chapman	Johnson, Ind.	Sparkman
Chenoweth	Jones	Spence
Clason	Kean	Stefan
Cochran	Kefauver	Stevenson
Colmer	Keogh	Summer, Ill.
Combs	Kerr	Summers, Tex.
Courtney	Kilday	Sundstrom
Cox	King	Tarver
Cravens	Knutson	Taylor
Crawford	LaFollette	Thomas, N. J.
Cunningham	Lea	Tolan
Curley	Luce	Torrens
Daughton, Va.	Lynch	Towe
Dawson	McCormack	Vinson
Delaney, John J.	McGehee	Voorhis, Calif.
Dirksen	McGlinchey	Vorys, Ohio
Dolliver	McMillan, S. C.	Vursell
Douglas, Calif.	Mahon	Wadsworth
Durham	Mankin	Welch
Dworshak	Merrill	White
Elliott	Mundt	Whitten
Elsaesser	Norton	Wigglesworth
Engle, Calif.	O'Neal	Winstead
Ervin	O'Toole	Winter
Fernandez	Patrick	Wolfenden, Pa.
Fuller	Pfeifer	Wood
Fulton	Ploeser	Woodhouse
	Plumley	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 290 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that further proceedings under the roll call be dispensed with.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 284, nays 6, not voting 140, as follows:

[Roll No. 146]

YEAS—284

Abernethy	Angell	Barden
Adams	Arends	Barrett, Pa.
Allen, Ill.	Arnold	Barrett, Wyo.
Allen, La.	Auchincloss	Barry
Almond	Bailey	Bates, Ky.
Andrews, Ala.	Baldwin, N. Y.	Bates, Mass.

Beckworth	Grant, Ind.	Miller, Calif.
Bell	Green	Miller, Nebr.
Bender	Gregory	Mills
Biemiller	Griffiths	Monroney
Blackney	Gross	Morgan
Bland	Gwinn, N. Y.	Morrison
Bloom	Gwynne, Iowa	Murdoch
Bolton	Hagen	Murphy
Bonner	Hale	Murray, Tenn.
Boren	Hall	Murray, Wis.
Boykin	Edwin Arthur	Neely
Bradley, Mich.	Hancock	Norblad
Bradley, Pa.	Hare	Norrell
Brehm	Harless, Ariz.	O'Brien, Ill.
Brooks	Harness, Ind.	O'Brien, Mich.
Brown, Ga.	Harris	O'Hara
Bryson	Hart	O'Konski
Buck	Havener	Patman
Butler	Hays	Patterson
Byrnes, Wis.	Healy	Peterson, Fla.
Camp	Hendricks	Peterson, Ga.
Cannon, Fla.	Henry	Philbin
Carlson	Herter	Phillips
Carnahan	Heseltun	Pickett
Case, N. J.	Hess	Powell
Case, S. Dak.	Hill	Pratt
Celler	Hinshaw	Price, Fla.
Chelf	Hobbs	Price, Ill.
Chiperfield	Hoch	Priest
Church	Hoever	Quinn, N. Y.
Clements	Hollfield	Rabin
Clevenger	Holmes, Mass.	Ramey
Clippinger	Holmes, Wash.	Randolph
Coffee	Hope	Rankin
Cole, Kans.	Horan	Rayfield
Cole, Mo.	Howell	Reed, Ill.
Cole, N. Y.	Huber	Reed, N. Y.
Cooley	Hull	Rees, Kans.
Cooper	Jarman	Rea
Corbett	Jenkins	Richards
Cravens	Jennings	Riley
Crosser	Jensen	Robertson,
Curtis	Johnson, Ill.	N. Dak.
D'Alesandro	Johnson,	Robertson, Va.
Davis	Lyndon B.	Robison, Ky.
De Lacy	Johnson, Okla.	Rockwell
DeLaney, James J.	Judd	Rodgers, Pa.
Delaney, John J.	Kearney	Roe, Md.
D'Ewart	Kee	Rogers, Fla.
Dingell	Kelley, Pa.	Rogers, Mass.
Domengaux	Kelly, Ill.	Rogers, N. Y.
Dondero	Kerr	Rowan
Doughton, N. C.	Kilburn	Ryder
Douglas, Ill.	Kinzer	Sabath
Doyle	Kirwan	Sadowski
Drewry	Klein	Sasser
Earthman	Knutson	Savage
Eaton	Kopplemann	Scrivner
Eberharter	Kunkel	Short
Ellis	Landis	Smith, Maine
Elston	Lane	Smith, Va.
Engel, Mich.	Lanham	Smith, Wis.
Fallon	Larcade	Somers, N. Y.
Feighan	LeCompte	Spence
Fellows	LeFevre	Springer
Fenton	Lemke	Starkey
Fisher	Lesinski	Stevenson
Flannagan	Lewis	Stockman
Flood	Link	Sullivan
Fogarty	McConnell	Taber
Forand	McCormack	Talle
Gallagher	McCowan	Thom
Gamble	McDonough	Thomason
Gary	McGregor	Tibbott
Gathings	McKenzie	Traynor
Gavin	McMillan, S. C.	Vursell
Geelan	McMillen, Ill.	Walter
Gerlach	Madden	Weaver
Gifford	Maloney	Welchel
Gillespie	Manasco	West
Gillum	Mansfield, Mont.	Whittington
Gillie	Mansfield, Tex.	Wickersham
Goodwin	Marcantonio	Wilson
Gore	Martin, Iowa	Wolcott
Gorski	Martin, Mass.	Wolverton, N. J.
Gossett	Mason	Woodhouse
Graham	Mathews	Woodruff
Granahan	May	Worley
Grant, Ala.	Mitchener	Zimmerman

NAYS—6

Hand	Lyle	Page
Jonkman	Pittenger	Rivers

NOT VOTING—140

Andersen, H. Carl	Beall	Buffett
Anderson, Calif.	Bennet, N. Y.	Bulwinkle
Andrews, August H.	Bennett, Mo.	Bunker
Andrews, N. Y.	Bishop	Byrne, N. Y.
Baldwin, Md.	Brown, Ohio	Campbell
	Brumbaugh	Canfield
	Buckley	Cannon, Mo.

Chapman	Hook	Russell
Chenoweth	Izac	Schwabe, Mo.
Clark	Jackson	Schwabe, Okla.
Clason	Johnson, Calif.	Shafer
Cochran	Johnson, Ind.	Sharp
Colmer	Johnson,	Sheppard
Combs	Luther A.	Sheridan
Courtney	Jones	Sikes
Cox	Kean	Simpson, Ill.
Crawford	Kefauver	Simpson, Pa.
Cunningham	Keogh	Slaughter
Curley	Kilday	Smith, Ohio
Daughton, Va.	King	Sparkman
Dawson	LaFollette	Stefan
Dirksen	Latham	Stewart
Dolliver	Lea	Stigler
Douglas, Calif.	Luce	Summer, Ill.
Durham	Ludlow	Summers, Tex.
Dworshak	Lynch	Sundstrom
Elliott	McGehee	Talbot
Ellsworth	McGlinchey	Tarver
Elsaesser	Mahon	Taylor
Engle, Calif.	Mankin	Thomas, N. J.
Ervin	Merrill	Thomas, Tex.
Fernandez	Mundt	Tolan
Folger	Norton	Torrens
Fuller	O'Neal	Towe
Fulton	O'Toole	Trimble
Gardner	Outland	Vinson
Gearhart	Pace	Voorhis, Calif.
Gibson	Patrick	Vorys, Ohio
Gordon	Pfeifer	Wadsworth
Granger	Ploeser	Wadsworth
Hall	Plumley	Wadsworth
Leonard W.	Rabaut	Wadsworth
Halleck	Rains	Wadsworth
Hartley	Reece, Tenn.	Wadsworth
Hébert	Rich	Wadsworth
Hedrick	Rizley	Wadsworth
Heffernan	Robinson, Utah	Wadsworth
Hoffman	Roe, N. Y.	Wadsworth

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. August H. Andersen.

Mr. Cannon of Missouri with Mr. Crawford.

Mr. Folger with Mr. Andrews of New York.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Latham.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Rich.

Mr. Luther A. Johnson with Mr. Talbot.

Mr. Cox with Mr. Wigglesworth.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Wasielewski with Mr. Hoffman.

Messrs. ABERNETHY, SMITH of Virginia,

RANKIN, and WEST changed their votes

from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts

[Mr. HERTER] on a point of order.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, as I said at the outset, it is within your discretion to rule on this point of order and there can be no appeal from your ruling; however, in making that ruling, it is obvious that you will be guided by two matters: First, by the chain of circumstances which have led to the point of order being made, and, secondly, by the precedents that have been set by your predecessors in ruling under similar circumstances.

Insofar as the first is concerned, the circumstances that have led to this particular point of order being made are obvious to every Member of this House. For the last few Wednesdays this House has done no business whatsoever. It has clearly been prevented from doing business because certain Members wished to avoid having certain matters come up here for discussion. In other words, sir, as long as the calendar contains certain pieces of legislation that have been favorably reported by your duly constituted committees but have not been

brought here under rule, they can only be brought up in this way, and as long as the Members of the House wish to avoid the calendar being reached they can delay action on those particular matters. We all know what they are.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand those words be taken down.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The words to be taken down are not the gentleman's words. They are words spoken by someone else years ago. How can the gentleman have those words taken down?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will be able to determine that when he sees the words taken down.

The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk reported the words objected to.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman from Massachusetts using his own words or was he quoting somebody?

Mr. HERTER. I was using my own words, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman used very strong language.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The Chair has the floor for the moment. The Chair will give the gentleman from Massachusetts the opportunity to ask unanimous consent to withdraw the words objected to.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask—

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. This proposition has come up in the regular way; and I would like for the Chair to rule on it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is attempting to withdraw the words.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that that is the usual way to proceed; if the gentleman is convinced that the words uttered violate the rules of the House, he is allowed to withdraw them.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that those words be stricken from the Record, and on that I demand recognition.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HERTER. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to withdraw those remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, owing to the fact that it is the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, for whom we all have great admiration, I will withdraw my point of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts may proceed.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, the second point that I wish to emphasize is the question of precedents that have been set by your predecessors under circumstances very similar to those which we are facing here today. I am reading now direct quotations from Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives, volume 8, page 424:

The motion to adjourn has been ruled out when dilatory.

On January 10, 1922, following the disposition of business on the Speaker's table, Mr. Finis J. Garrett, of Tennessee, made the point of order that there was not a quorum present.

The Speaker sustained the point of order and Mr. Frank W. Mondell, of Wyoming, moved a call of the House.

A quorum having responded, Mr. Mondell moved to suspend further proceedings under the call.

On demand of Mr. Garrett, the yeas and nays were ordered on the motion to dispense with proceedings under the call, and the vote being taken, was decided in the affirmative—yeas 272, nays 56.

Mr. Garrett offered a motion that the House adjourn.

Mr. Nicholas Longworth, of Ohio, made the point of order that the motion was dilatory.

Mr. Garrett submitted that the motion to adjourn had not been previously made during the day's session.

The Speaker ruled:

"The Chair does not think the fact that it is the first time today that the motion to adjourn has been made proves that it is not dilatory. The Chair believes that it is well known to all Members of the House that when this antilynching bill has been up before, or has been imminent, there has been a deliberate attempt at obstruction led by the gentleman from Tennessee, and today on the vote just taken the gentleman from Tennessee demanded the yeas and nays on the motion to dispense with further proceedings under the call, a mere formal motion on which a record vote meant nothing. That obviously was done to kill time.

"In deciding what is dilatory the Chair thinks he should be very careful, because his decision is final; but, on the other hand, he does not think there can be any question in the minds of any of the Members of the House present that the purpose of the gentleman from Tennessee in making this motion is delay, and not the expectation or intention of accomplishing any other result by the motion. Therefore the Chair thinks that the motion is dilatory."

Mr. Speaker, I could read other quotations and other citations.

Mr. RANKIN. I wish the gentleman would.

Mr. HERTER. However, it seems to me that we have a situation that is so similar in this case that we can only appeal to you, sir, to your fairness and your good judgment, to rule that the point of order is well taken.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, with all deference to our distinguished friend from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER] I desire to say that he is entirely wrong. No man ever presided over this House for whom I had a higher regard than Speaker Gillett.

I was here when that decision was made. I thought it was wrong then,

and I think so now. The distinguished Speaker of this House [Mr. RAYBURN] was here at that time. He remembers, I am sure.

We were going through a partisan fight on what they called the antilynching bill that, to be perfectly frank with you, not 1 man out of 10 really wanted passed, but they were being prodded, just as you are being prodded now, by political pressure and agitation on the outside.

That was in January 1922, and Finis J. Garrett, one of the ablest men I have ever known, was the minority leader; and believe me, it was a minority at that time. The Republicans had a majority of 169 in this House, and any decision that Mr. Gillett might have made would have been sustained. So this question came up, in the very heat of that debate, on an issue that was just as nonsensical as this one is today. Nine out of ten of you do not want the so-called FEPC bill to come before the House. I am speaking to both you Democrats and Republicans. I am not saying that offensively, because you know I do not entertain that kind of attitude toward you.

But the FEPC bill has dynamite in it, it has poison in it. It is the most dangerous piece of communistic nonsense anybody has ever attempted to ram through the Congress of the United States.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that he is not addressing himself to the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi will proceed in order and discuss the point of order.

Mr. RANKIN. I was merely bringing up the background and discussing this proposition in the light of the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Addressing the Chair again, I notice that the man who is leading this fight, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], did not interfere with him, but I do not want to violate the rules of the House, of course.

Now, Mr. Speaker, suppose that ruling were correct? Are you just going to sit here and do nothing and deny a Member the right to move to adjourn?

I see my distinguished friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] before me. He was here at that time, and he knows they sat here until way in the night and then they finally did just what Mr. Garrett attempted to do late in the afternoon—they adjourned. For the Speaker of this House to hold that it is out of order to make a motion to adjourn the Congress when deep down in their hearts an overwhelming majority of this Congress wants to adjourn, I simply say I do not think the present Speaker would assume that responsibility.

We have a motion to adjourn. We have gone on here for 3½ hours. We are no further along than when we started. You remind me of some drunken men trying to cross the Tennessee River in a boat one night. They paddled until they wore themselves out. They looked around the next morning about an hour by sun and found that they had never untied the boat.

That is the position we are in today. We have gone on here for 3½ hours and

have not moved a peg, and you are not going to move a peg so far as this crazy FEPC bill is concerned, because even if any measure is taken up, it will be some measure from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, or perhaps some other committee. Suppose you go ahead and consider the bill from our committee until 8 or 9 o'clock tonight and some Member gets up and moves to adjourn, and then somebody wants to hold us here until midnight to try to make us vote on something that none of us want to vote on and that is not even before the House. Then do you think the Speaker would be justified in holding that that was a dilatory motion? I submit that a motion to adjourn at this time is in order, and I hope the Chair will overrule the point of order of my distinguished friend from Massachusetts [Mr. HERTER].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, since I made the motion, may I be permitted to be heard?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts brought up what had transpired on previous Wednesdays. I submit that what took place on previous Wednesdays has no place in the question now involved. We are now considering what transpires on this particular Wednesday.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. I call attention to the fact that when the decision was rendered to which he referred, it was not on Calendar Wednesday, but at a time when we had a bill under consideration before the House.

Mr. RIVERS. Yes; I am coming to that point.

Reading from section 783 of rule XVI, the language is as follows:

The motion to adjourn not only has the highest precedence when a question is under debate, but with certain restrictions it has the highest privilege under all other conditions.

We have nothing under debate here. We have not even gotten to the first thing under the Calendar Wednesday rule. We have had a number of parliamentary conditions which under certain conditions I might concede are dilatory. But I submit the motion to adjourn is always in order. It is not debatable. Because somebody in the dim, distant past held that a motion to adjourn was dilatory, that is no reason for the Speaker today to perpetuate that mistake. My friend over yonder, for whom I have the greatest esteem, has hollered about precedent. Do you not know that you boys on that side of the House these days are against the Supreme Court because they have forgotten what precedent is? You should holler about precedent. Now when the Supreme Court wants to kick over the principle of stare decisis, they holler about the general welfare. Mr. Speaker, this is a clean-cut point of fairness. The House wants to adjourn, and the rules give us that right. I submit my motion is in order and it is not made for the purpose of delay. I think the Speaker in spite of his great record for fairness

would be presumptuous indeed to think that I would want to be dilatory. I want to get out of here just like you want to do.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is familiar with the rulings made by Speaker Gillett to which the gentleman from Massachusetts refers. One of the greatest responsibilities any occupant of the Chair could assume would be to hold that motions are dilatory. However, that is not to say that the present occupant of the Chair will not, under certain circumstances, hold motions to be dilatory. In the weeks to come and for the remainder of this day the Chair will scrutinize very carefully motions that are made.

The Chair is going to put the motion to adjourn.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 114, noes 113.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 102, nays 188, not voting 140, as follows:

[Roll No. 147]

YEAS—102

Abernethy	Gifford	Murray, Tenn.
Allen, La.	Gore	Norrell
Almond	Gossett	O'Hara
Andrews, Ala.	Grant, Ala.	O'Konski
Barden	Gregory	Pace
Bates, Ky.	Griffiths	Patman
Beckworth	Gwynne, Iowa	Peterson, Fla.
Bell	Hancock	Peterson, Ga.
Bland	Hare	Pickett
Boren	Harris	Poage
Boykin	Hays	Pratt
Brooks	Hobbs	Price, Fla.
Brown, Ga.	Holmes, Mass.	Priest
Bryson	Howell	Rains
Camp	Jarman	Rankin
Chelf	Jennings	Reed, Ill.
Clark	Johnson,	Richards
Clements	Luther A.	Riley
Clevenger	Johnson,	Rivers
Cooley	Lyndon B.	Rockwell
Cooper	Kerr	Roe, Md.
Cox	Kilburn	Rogers, Fla.
Cravens	Lanham	Russell
Davis	Larcade	Short
Domengeaux	Lyle	Sikes
Doughton, N. C.	McGehee	Smith, Va.
Drewry	McKenzie	Stigler
Earthman	McMillan, S. C.	Stockman
Eaton	Maloney	Thomas, Tex.
Fellows	Manasco	Weaver
Fisher	Mansfield, Tex.	West
Flannagan	May	Whittington
Folger	Millis	Wickersham
Gary	Monroney	Worley
Gathings	Morrison	

NAYS—188

Adams	Carnahan	Elston
Allen, Ill.	Case, N. J.	Fallon
Andresen,	Case, S. Dak.	Feighan
August H.	Celler	Fenton
Angell	Chapfield	Flood
Arends	Church	Fogarty
Arnold	Clippinger	Forand
Auchincloss	Coffee	Gallagher
Bailey	Cole, Kans.	Gamble
Baldwin, N. Y.	Cole, Mo.	Gavin
Barrett, Pa.	Cole, N. Y.	Geelan
Barrett, Wyo.	Corbett	Gerlach
Barry	Crosser	Gillespie
Bates, Mass.	Cunningham	Gillette
Bender	Curtis	Gillie
Bennet, N. Y.	D'Alesandro	Goodwin
Biemiller	De Lacy	Gorski
Blackney	Delaney,	Graham
Bloom	James J.	Granahan
Bolton	Delaney,	Grant, Ind.
Bradley, Mich.	John J.	Green
Bradley, Pa.	D'Ewart	Gross
Brehm	Dingell	Hagen
Buck	Douglas, Ill.	Hale
Butler	Doyle	Hand
Byrnes, Wis.	Eberhart	Harless, Ariz.
Carlson	Ellis	Harness, Ind.

Hart	Link	Rees, Kans.
Havenner	Lynch	Rea
Healy	McConnell	Robertson,
Henry	McCown	N. Dak.
Herter	McDonough	Robison, Ky.
Heseltun	McGregor	Rodgers, Pa.
Hess	McMillen, Ill.	Rogers, Mass.
Hill	Madden	Rooney
Hinshaw	Mansfield,	Rowan
Hoch	Mont.	Ryder
Hoeven	Marcantonio	Sabath
Hollifield	Martin, Iowa	Sadowski
Holmes, Wash.	Martin, Mass.	Sasser
Hope	Mason	Savage
Horan	Mathews	Scrivner
Huber	Michener	Smith, Maine
Hull	Miller, Calif.	Smith, Wis.
Jenkins	Miller, Nebr.	Somers, N. Y.
Jensen	Morgan	Springer
Johnson, Okla.	Murdock	Starkey
Jonkman	Murphy	Stevenson
Judd	Murray, Wis.	Sullivan
Kearney	Neely	Taber
Kee	Norblad	Talle
Keefe	O'Brien, Ill.	Thom
Kelley, Pa.	O'Brien, Mich.	Thomason
Kinzer	Patterson	Tibbott
Klein	Philbin	Traynor
Kopplemann	Phillips	Voorhis, Calif.
Kunkel	Pittenger	Walter
Landis	Powell	Weichel
Lane	Price, Ill.	Wilson
Latham	Quinn, N. Y.	Wolcott
LeCompte	Rabin	Wolverton, N. J.
LeFevre	Ramey	Woodhouse
Lemke	Randolph	Woodruff
Lesinski	Raybel	
Lewis	Reed, N. Y.	

NOT VOTING—140

Andersen,	Gibson	Rabaut
H. Carl	Gordon	Reece, Tenn.
Anderson, Calif.	Granger	Rich
Andrews, N. Y.	Gwinn, N. Y.	Ritzley
Baldwin, Md.	Hall,	Robertson, Va.
Beall	Edwin Arthur	Robinson, Utah
Bennett, Mo.	Hall,	Roe, N. Y.
Bishop	Leonard W.	Rogers, N. Y.
Bonner	Halleck	Schwabe, Mo.
Brown, Ohio	Hartley	Schwabe, Okla.
Brumbaugh	Hebert	Sharp
Buckley	Hedrick	Sheppard
Buffett	Hefferman	Sheridan
Bulwinkle	Hendricks	Simpson, Ill.
Bunker	Hoffman	Simpson, Pa.
Byrne, N. Y.	Hook	Slaughter
Campbell	Izac	Smith, Ohio
Canfield	Jackson	Sparkman
Cannon, Fla.	Johnson, Calif.	Spence
Cannon, Mo.	Johnson, Ill.	Stefan
Chapman	Johnson, Ind.	Stewart
Chenoweth	Jones	Sumner, Ill.
Clason	Kean	Sumners, Tex.
Cochran	Kefauver	Sundstrom
Colmer	Kelly, Ill.	Talbot
Combs	Keogh	Tarver
Courtney	Kilday	Taylor
Crawford	King	Thomas, N. J.
Curley	Kirwan	Tolan
Daughton, Va.	Knutson	Torrens
Dawson	LaFollette	Towse
Dirksen	Lea	Trimble
Dolliver	Luce	Vinson
Dondero	Ludlow	Vorys, Ohio
Douglas, Calif.	McCormack	Vursell
Durham	McGlinchey	Wadsworth
Dworshak	Mahon	Wasielewski
Elliott	Mankin	Welch
Ellsworth	Marrow	White
Elsaesser	Mundt	Whitten
Engel, Mich.	Norton	Wigglesworth
Engle, Calif.	O'Neal	Winstead
Ervin	O'Toole	Winter
Fernandez	Outland	Wolfenden, Pa.
Fuller	Patrick	Wood
Fulton	Pfeifer	Zimmerman
Gardner	Ploeser	
Gearhart	Plumley	

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Bonner with Mr. Dondero.

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Engel of Michigan.

Mr. Outland with Mr. Gwinn of New York.

Mr. Rogers of New York with Mr. Johnson of Illinois.

Mr. Robinson of Utah with Mr. Knutson.

Mr. Tarver with Mr. Vursell.

Mr. GAVIN, Mr. FENTON, and Mr. RANDOLPH changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Mississippi rise.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. To propound a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. My inquiry is this: In the event that the House were to agree to dispense with further proceedings under Calendar Wednesday, would it then be in order for the remainder of the day for the other business on the House program for the week and especially the river and harbor bill, which was under consideration when the House adjourned yesterday afternoon to be taken up immediately if so desired by the leadership, including the Speaker and the chairmen of the committees concerned?

The SPEAKER. If the House dispenses with further proceedings under Calendar Wednesday, then the House can do what it pleases.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That was my inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore move that the House dispense with further proceedings under Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. That can only be done by unanimous consent.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, that motion is not in order. To dispense with Calendar Wednesday requires the unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, with your indulgence, may I say that I agree that to dispense with Calendar Wednesday entirely can only be done by unanimous consent, but when there has been a call, and the Committee on Banking and Currency has been called, I respectfully submit that dispensing with the remainder of the proceedings under Calendar Wednesday is in order and that the point of order does not lie.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. Without reference to the current controversy, may I call the Speaker's attention to the fact that Calendar Wednesday is presumed to be the people's day; that is, all committees are called in order, and whether a bill comes up for consideration rests entirely within the control of the committee having the call, the majority leadership and the Rules Committee to the contrary notwithstanding.

Calendar Wednesday is usually dispensed with only by unanimous consent. There would be very little use for such a day if this were not the case. General legislation on other days is programed by the leadership; not so on Calendar Wednesday. It would, therefore, seem fundamental if the purposes of the rule are to be carried out, that the commit-

tees should be called in order. Were it otherwise, the majority which controls other programs could control proceedings on Calendar Wednesday.

It would seem fair to proceed with the call of committees, and that no motion to dispense with further proceedings under the Calendar Wednesday rule should be in order.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, may I say further that the motion is not in order because the call of the calendar is mandatory. That motion cannot have preference over the call of the Calendar. The only motion that can be considered, as I understand, would be a motion to adjourn, upon which the House has just voted.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, with your indulgence, I have no disposition to delay proceedings, but permit me to say it has been the general and practically universal practice with respect to dispensing with further proceedings under Calendar Wednesday, that that motion has frequently been made when one committee of this House has been called. I submit that to the recollection and to the judgment not only of the Speaker but to the Members of the House.

I respectfully maintain, Mr. Speaker, that the point of order does not lie.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If I have the floor.

Mr. RANKIN. If you will go back and search the RECORD of Calendar Wednesday proceedings, you will find that time and time again when one committee has been called, then a motion has been made to dispense with further proceedings under Calendar Wednesday, and that motion carried.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. If further proceedings are dispensed with, then the House can proceed to transact other business for the remainder of the day, including the unfinished river and harbor bill that is pending.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the following was held by Speaker Gillett, who has been quoted today, as follows:

The Speaker is constrained to recognize on Wednesdays any Member proposing a motion to dispense with further proceedings in order on that day.

The motion is in order, but it takes a two-thirds vote to pass it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, does that motion require a two-thirds vote?

The SPEAKER. It does.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I did not understand the Speaker's answer.

The SPEAKER. The answer was that to suspend the call of the calendar on Wednesday requires a two-thirds vote.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is a mere motion now to dispense with further proceedings the same as a motion to suspend the rules altogether? My motion is to simply suspend further proceedings under the call of Calendar Wednesday. I maintain there is a distinction between dispensing with the call altogether and dispensing with further proceedings under the call.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will read the rule so that there will be no misunderstanding:

On Wednesday of each week no business shall be in order except as provided by paragraph 4 of this rule unless the House, by a two-thirds vote on motion to suspend therewith, shall otherwise determine.

The question is on the motion to dispense with further proceedings under Calendar Wednesday.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Does that motion not have to be made at the very beginning of the day?

The SPEAKER. The Chair holds otherwise.

The question is on the motion to dispense with further proceedings under Calendar Wednesday.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 103, noes 97.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 107, nays 183, not voting 140, as follows:

[Roll No. 148]

YEAS—107

Abernethy	Grant, Ala.	Norrell
Allen, La.	Gregory	O'Hara
Almond	Gross	Pace
Andrews, Ala.	Gwynne, Iowa	Patman
Arnold	Hancock	Peterson, Fla.
Bates, Ky.	Hare	Peterson, Ga.
Beckworth	Harris	Pickett
Bell	Hays	Poage
Bland	Hendricks	Pratt
Boren	Hobbs	Price, Fla.
Brooks	Holmes, Mass.	Priest
Brown, Ga.	Howell	Rains
Bryson	Jarman	Rankin
Camp	Jennings	Richards
Chelf	Johnson, Ill.	Riley
Clark	Johnson,	Rivers
Clements	Luther A.	Rockwell
Cole, Mo.	Johnson,	Roe, Md.
Cole, N. Y.	Lyndon B.	Rogers, Fla.
Cooley	Johnson, Okla.	Russell
Cooper	Kilburn	Short
Cox	Lanham	Sikes
Cravens	Larcade	Smith, Va.
Domenegeaux	LeFevre	Stigler
Dondero	Lyle	Stockman
Doughton, N. C.	McGehee	Tarver
Drewry	McKenzie	Thomas, Tex.
Earthman	McMillan, S. C.	Thomason
Fellows	Maloney	Weaver
Fisher	Manasco	West
Flannagan	Mansfield, Tex.	Whitten
Folger	Mason	Whittington
Gary	May	Wickersham
Gathings	Mills	Worley
Gifford	Monroney	Zimmerman
Gore	Morrison	
Gossett	Murray, Tenn.	

NAYS—183

Adams	Butler	Delaney,
Allen, Ill.	Byrnes, Wis.	John J.
Andresen,	Cannon, Mo.	D'Ewart
August H.	Carlson	Dingell
Angell	Carnahan	Dirksen
Arends	Case, N. J.	Douglas, Ill.
Auchincloss	Case, S. Dak.	Doyle
Baldwin, N. Y.	Celler	Eaton
Barrett, Pa.	Chapfield	Eberharter
Barry	Church	Ellis
Bates, Mass.	Clevenger	Elston
Bender	Clippinger	Engel, Mich.
Bennet, N.Y.	Cole, Kans.	Fallon
Biemiller	Corbett	Feighan
Blackney	Crosser	Fenton
Bloom	Cunningham	Flood
Bolton	Curtis	Fogarty
Bradley, Pa.	D'Alesandro	Forand
Brehm	Delaney,	Gallagher
Buck	James J.	Gamble

Gavin	Kelley, Pa.	Quinn, N. Y.
Geelan	Kelly, Ill.	Rabin
Gerlach	Kinzer	Ramey
Gillespie	Klein	Randolph
Gillette	Knutson	Rayfiel
Goodwin	Kopplemann	Reed, Ill.
Gordon	Kunkel	Reed, N. Y.
Gorski	Landis	Rees, Kans.
Graham	Lane	Reza
Granahan	Latham	Robertson,
Grant, Ind.	LeCompte	N. Dak.
Green	Lemke	Robison, Ky.
Griffiths	Lesinski	Rodgers, Pa.
Hagen	Lewis	Rogers, Mass.
Hale	Link	Rooney
Hall	McConnell	Rowan
Edwin Arthur	McCormack	Ryder
Hand	McCowan	Sabath
Harless, Ariz.	McDonough	Sadowski
Harness, Ind.	McMillen, Ill.	Sasser
Havener	Madden	Savage
Healy	Mansfield,	Scrivner
Henry	Mont.	Smith, Maine
Herter	Marcantonio	Smith, Wis.
Heseltun	Martin, Iowa	Somers, N. Y.
Hess	Martin, Mass.	Springer
Hill	Mathews	Starkey
Hinshaw	Michener	Stevenson
Hoch	Miller, Calif.	Sullivan
Hoeven	Miller, Nebr.	Taber
Holifield	Morgan	Talbot
Holmes, Wash.	Murphy	Talle
Hope	Murray, Wis.	Thom
Horan	Neely	Tibbott
Huber	Norblad	Traynor
Hull	O'Brien, Ill.	Voorhis, Calif.
Jenkins	O'Konski	Walter
Jensen	Patterson	Welchel
Jonkman	Phillbin	Wilson
Judd	Phillips	Wolcott
Kearney	Pittenger	Wolverton, N. J.
Kee	Powell	Woodhouse
Keefe	Price, Ill.	Woodruff

NOT VOTING—140

Andersen,	Fuller	Pfeifer
H. Carl	Fulton	Ploeser
Anderson, Calif.	Gardner	Plumley
Andrews, N. Y.	Gearhart	Rabaut
Bailey	Gibson	Reece, Tenn.
Baldwin, Md.	Gillie	Rich
Barden	Granger	Rizley
Barrett, Wyo.	Gwinn, N. Y.	Robertson, Va.
Beall	Hall,	Robinson, Utah
Bennett, Mo.	Leonard W.	Roe, N. Y.
Bishop	Halleck	Rogers, N. Y.
Bonner	Hart	Schwabe, Mo.
Boykin	Hartley	Schwabe, Okla.
Bradley, Mich.	Hébert	Shafer
Brown, Ohio	Hedrick	Sharp
Brumbaugh	Heffernan	Sheppard
Buckley	Hoffman	Sheridan
Buffett	Hook	Simpson, Ill.
Bulwinkle	Izac	Simpson, Pa.
Bunker	Jackson	Slaughter
Byrne, N. Y.	Johnson, Calif.	Smith, Ohio
Campbell	Johnson, Ind.	Sparkman
Canfield	Jones	Spence
Cannon, Fla.	Kean	Stefan
Chapman	Kefauver	Stewart
Chenoweth	Keogh	Sumner, Ill.
Clason	Kerr	Sumners, Tex.
Cochran	Kilday	Sundstrom
Coffee	King	Taylor
Colmer	Kirwan	Thomas, N. J.
Combs	LaFollette	Tolan
Courtney	Lea	Torrens
Crawford	Luca	Towe
Curley	Ludlow	Trimble
Daughton, Va.	Lynch	Vinson
Davis	McGlinchey	Vorys, Ohio
Dawson	McGregor	Vursell
De Lacy	Mahon	Wadsworth
Dolliver	Mankin	Wasielewski
Douglas, Calif.	Merrow	Welch
Durham	Mundt	White
Dworshak	Murdock	Wigglesworth
Elliott	Norton	Winstead
Ellsworth	O'Brien, Mich.	Winter
Elsasser	O'Neal	Wolfenden, Pa.
Engle, Calif.	O'Toole	Wood
Ervin	Outland	
Fernandez	Patrick	

So two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof, the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Coffey with Mr. Barrett of Wyoming.

Mr. De Lacy with Mr. Gillie.

Mr. Hart with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. Lynch with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Murdock with Mr. McGregor.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Ploeser.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the next committee on the calendar.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, would the Speaker recognize me at this time so that I might express my pleasure at the appointment of Senator WARREN AUSTIN?

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not recognize the gentlemen from Massachusetts for that purpose.

The Clerk will call the next committee on the calendar.

The Clerk called the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) the House divided and the Chair announced that the ayes were 145 and the noes were 43.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Has the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures been disposed of on the calendar?

The SPEAKER. It has been passed.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 6, 1946, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

The Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments will hold hearings on the President's Reorganization Plans Nos. 1, 2, and 3 beginning at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, June 4, through Friday, June 7.

AVIATION SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Aviation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Thursday, June 6, 1946.

Business to be considered: Public hearing on the bill (H. R. 6417) to amend the Federal Airport Act.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

On Thursday, June 6, 1946, Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the Judiciary will continue hearings on the bill (H. R. 6301) to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes. The hearings will begin at 10 a. m. and will be held in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building.

On Wednesday, June 12, 1946, Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary will hold a hearing on the bill (H. R. 6143) to incorporate the Amvets, American Veterans of World War II. The meeting will be held in the Judiciary Committee room, 346 House Office Building, and will begin at 10 a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1368. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Postmaster General to accept gifts and bequests for the benefit of the Library of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1369. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of the Miami Herald, the Key West Citizen, and the Miami Daily News; to the Committee on Claims.

1370. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of War to grant to the Georgia Power Co. a 100-foot perpetual easement across Fort Benning in the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. STIGLER: Committee on Claims. S. 593. An act for the relief of Warrant Officer Wayne C. Proper; without amendment (Rept. No. 2212). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOYLE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1957. A bill for the relief of Frank Sable; with amendments (Rept. No. 2213). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STIGLER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2132. A bill for the relief of Raleigh B. Diamond; with amendments (Rept. No. 2214). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOYLE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2319. A bill for the relief of J. B. Shropshire, Firemen's Insurance Co. of Newark, N. J., and Pacific Employers Insurance Co., of San Francisco, Calif.; with amendments (Rept. No. 2215). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STIGLER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3145. A bill for the relief of A. C. McMeans; with amendment (Rept. No. 2216). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DOYLE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3857. A bill for the relief of Warren H. Thompson and Madeline Parent; with amendments (Rept. No. 2217). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. COMBS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4265. A bill for the relief of Mary Jane Sherman; with amendment (Rept. No. 2218). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STIGLER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4415. A bill for the relief of L. O. Gilliam; with amendment (Rept. No. 2219). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STIGLER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4592. A bill for the relief of the Quality Electric Co., Ltd.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2220). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McGEHEE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4660. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Georgia Lanier and Ensign Joseph Lanier; with amendments (Rept. No. 2221). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STIGLER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5025. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Opal Riley and Robert R. Riley; with amendments (Rept. No. 2222). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STIGLER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5279. A bill for the relief of the Dixie Margarine Co., a Tennessee corporation, of Memphis, Tenn.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2223). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STIGLER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5304. A bill for the relief of Pearson Remedy Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2224). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5722. A bill for the relief of Charles L. Cannon; with amendment (Rept. No. 2225). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 6690. A bill providing for payments in lieu of taxes upon certain surplus property and the payment of taxes thereon when leased or sold to private interests by conditional sale, and authorizing the taxation and assessment thereof for State and local purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 6681. A bill to create United States civil service boards of appeals; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. GWYNNE of Iowa:

H. R. 6682. A bill to amend sections 81, 82, and 83, and to repeal section 84 of chapter IX of the act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to exempt all veterans of World War II from the payment of any Federal income taxes during their tenure of service and for 1 year subsequent to honorable discharge on net income not exceeding \$2,500 per annum; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Honorable Provincial Board of Camarines Sur, Philippines, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States with reference to protest of an amendment to the Tydings-McDuffie independence law; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JAMES J. DELANEY:

H. R. 6683. A bill for the relief of Agricultural Insurance Co. and others; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GORE:

H. R. 6684. A bill for the relief of Charles Edward Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAMEY:

H. R. 6685. A bill for the relief of William Grimes and Catherine Grimes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SOMERS of New York:

H. R. 6686. A bill for the relief of Joseph Villar (Youssef Tchikvaoglou); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1932. By the SPEAKER: Petition of president, Kolawin Reading Club, Barrio Kolawin, Argaw, Cebu, P. I., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to request for rehabilitation of its library; to the Committee on the Library.

1933. Also, petition of T4g George E. Wuest, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to draft legislation and demobilization; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1934. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Mrs. Josie M. Roberts, superintendent, the Methodist Hospital, San Jacinto and Rosalie Streets, Houston 4, Tex., favoring S. 191; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1935. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the members of the International Union of United Brewery, Flour, Cereal, and Soft Drink Workers of America, in opposition to proposed prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 6, 1946

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 5, 1946)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, we thank Thee for the new day bathed in the glory of June, for the dawn orchestra of birds' song, for the fragrance and tint of the tiniest flower, for the mystic beauty of lights and shadows weaving patterns of splendor across the verdant fields and templed hills. Through it all, and in the laughter and tears of our fellow pilgrims and in our own souls, tune our hearts to hear Thy voice, that we may know we are not alone. Deliver us from the folly of coming to Thee with empty words burdened with no agony of desire. So gird our lives that here, in the ministry of public affairs, we may make decisions greatly, walk on the high levels of noble purposes, and with kindling sympathies as wide as human need in all things quit us like men. In the Redeemer's blessed name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LA FOLLETTE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, June 5, 1946, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on June 5, 1946, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 470. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim or claims of W. P. Richardson, as successor and assignee of W. P. Richardson & Co., of Tampa, Fla.;

S. 769. An act for the relief of H. H. Ashbrook, and others;

S. 913. An act to protect scenic values along and tributary to the Catalina Highway within the Coronado National Forest, Ariz.;

S. 1106. An act for the relief of Malcolm K. Burke;

S. 1286. An act for the relief of Sam Beechold;

S. 1605. An act to reimburse certain Navy and Marine Corps personnel and former Navy and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of fires which occurred at various Navy and Marine Corps shore activities;

S. 1802. An act to provide for the delivery of custody of certain articles of historic interest from the U. S. S. Nevada and the U. S. S. Wyoming to the State of Nevada and the State of Wyoming, respectively;

S. 1805. An act to authorize the promotion of personnel of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard who were prisoners of war;

S. 1854. An act to establish the civilian position of academic dean of the Postgraduate School of the Naval Academy and compensation therefor;

S. 1862. An act to repeal section 1548, Revised Statutes (34 U. S. C. 592);

S. 1871. An act to authorize the conveyance of a parcel of land at the naval supply depot, Bayonne, N. J., to the American Radiator & Standard Sanitary Corp.;

S. 1959. An act to authorize the payment of additional uniform gratuity to Reserve officers commissioned from the status of aviation cadets; and

S. 1978. An act to authorize the restoration of Philip Niekum, Jr., to the active list of the United States Navy with appropriate rank and restoration of pay and allowances.

REPRESENTATION OF CONGRESS AT MEETING OF EMPIRE PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION AT BERMUDA

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under authority of Senate Concurrent Resolution 58, the Chair appoints the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] as the Members of the Senate to attend the meeting of the Empire Parliamentary Association at Bermuda, beginning June 10, 1946, and designates the Senator from Rhode Island as the chairman of the delegation.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report reciting the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 182 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service under the authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Immigration.

GIFTS AND BEQUESTS FOR BENEFIT OF POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT LIBRARY

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Postmaster General to accept gifts and bequests for the benefit of the library of the Post Office Department (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.